













THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW,  
OR  
*CRITICAL JOURNAL:*

FOR  
JULY, 1874 . . . . . OCTOBER, 1874.

*TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.*

---

---

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

---

---

VOL. CXL.

LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER, LONDON.  
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,  
EDINBURGH.

---

1874.

LONDON : PRINTED BY  
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE  
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

## CONTENTS OF No. 286.

	Page
ART. I.—Das Leben des Generals Von Scharnhorst. Von G. H. Klippel. Leipsic: 1870, . . . . .	287
II.—The Book of Carlaverock: Memoirs of the Maxwells, Earls of Nithsdale, Lords Maxwell and Herries. By William Fraser. Vol. I. Memoirs. Vol. II. Correspondence and Charters. Quarto. Edinburgh: 1873,	322
III.—1. London Lyrics. By Frederick Locker. New Edition. London: 1874.	
2. The Courtly Poets from Raleigh to Montrose. Edited by J. Hannah, D.C.L. London: 1870.	
3. The Poems of Winthrop Mackworth Praed. With a Memoir by the Rev. Derwent Coleridge. London: 1864.	
4. The Greek Anthology. By Lord Neaves. Edinburgh: 1874.	
5. <i>Lyra Elegantiarum</i> . A Collection of some of the best Specimens of Vers de Société in the English Language. Edited by F. Locker. London: 1864.	
6. Two Centuries of Song. With Critical and Biographical Notes by Walter Thornbury. London: 1866, . . . . .	355
IV.—1. Statistique de la France. Résultats généraux du Dénombrement de 1872. Imprimerie Nationale. Paris: 1874.	
2. Recensement de la Population de la France en 1872. Par M. Raudot, Député de l'Yonne. Paris: 1874, .	363
V.—1. On the Re-discovery of Biela's Comet. By M. Klinkerfues. 'Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society.' London: 1873.	
2. Alcuni risultate preliminari tratte dalle osservazioni di Stelli caduti. By G. V. Schiaparelli. Milan: 1870.	
3. The Fuel of the Sun. By W. Mattieu Williams, F.C.S. London: 1870.	

	Page
4. Account of Donati's Comet of 1858. By G. Bond. Cambridge, United States: 1858.	
5. The Comets; a Descriptive Treatise. By J. R. Hind. London: 1852.	
6. Cometographie. By A. W. Pingré. Paris: 1783, .	393
VI.—1. A Bill intituled 'An Act to provide for the Revision 'and Amendment of the Rubrics contained in the 'Book of Common Prayer.' Presented to the House of Lords by the Lord Bishop of London, June 19, 1874.	
2. Synodalia, Journal and Chronicle of the Convocation for the Province of Canterbury. London: 1854— 1874.	
3. Parliamentary Debates on Public Worship Regula- tion Bill. 1874, . . . . .	427
VII.—The Origin and History of the Grenadier Guards. By Lieutenant-General Sir F. W. Hamilton, late Grena- dier Guards. In Three Volumes, 8vo. London: 1874, . . . . .	
	462
VIII.—L'Antechrist. Par Ernest Renan. Paris: 1873, .	
	485
IX.—A Journal of the Reigns of King George IV. and King William IV. By the late Charles C. F. Greville, Esq., Clerk of the Council to those Sovereigns. Edited by Henry Reeve, Registrar of the Privy Council. Three Volumes, 8vo. London: 1874, . . . . .	
	515
X.—Hansard's Parliamentary Debates for the Session of 1874. April to August. London: 1874, . . . . .	
	549
INDEX TO VOL. CXL., . . . . .	
	591

22.3.75  
.052701  
THE Vol. 146  
(p. 2)



# EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OCTOBER, 1874.

---

No. CCLXXXVI.

---

ART. I.—*Das Leben des Generals Von Scharnhorst.* Von  
G. H. KLIPPEL. Leipsic: 1870.

PRUSSIA, as all the world admits, exhibits the strongest types of statesmanship and strategy that our age has produced; and statesman and strategist have combined their powers to raise her from a second-class kingdom to be the foremost military Power in Europe. But Bismarck's sagacity and Von Moltke's science might have been in vain had they not possessed, in the national organisation for war, the mightiest engine the world has ever seen framed. And Prussia does not forget the obligation she owes to the great man—a Prussian only by adoption, a German above all—who founded her military system, and who in doing so prepared those victories of the War of Independence in 1813-14, which he was not spared to share, yet which but for him would hardly have been won. Herr Klippel's great work has not the less been read because it appeared at a new crisis in the world's history, when his hero's country was seen to rise again as one man under arms against the hereditary foe for whose first overthrow the weapon was forged by Scharnhorst sixty years before.

Yet Scharnhorst himself, who came from Hanover to be the tutor of the Prussian nation, was but the pupil of an earlier teacher in a principality yet smaller than the Electorate which gave him birth. No fact is brought out more clearly than this in Herr Klippel's volumes; and before passing to his own career, it is but just to dwell on the memory of the instructor to whom the regenerator of the Prussian service owed so much. Those too, who imagine that military science is but the fancy of a day, and owes its study rather to men's immediate needs than to one of the deeper instincts of the race,

may study profitably the history of Count William of Lippe and the school which he founded. For there Scharnhorst in a time of settled peace imbibed the knowledge which was long after to fructify, in the days when Prussia, under his sage teaching, drew strength out of disaster, and honour out of humiliation.

Little loved by, and loving little the aristocracy of his island kingdom, George II. was ever ready to show favour to the sons of the small German princes with whom he felt a real kinship. His near neighbour in the Empire, and the faithful ally of Hanover, the Sovereign Count of Schaumburg-Lippe, had no difficulty in obtaining a commission in the British Guards for his second son, Count William, a boy of striking quickness and intelligence, who from his earliest childhood had evinced his passion for a soldier's life. The young ensign had received his first education in England, where his parents had spent much of their time as guests of George I., and is said to have spoken English as well as French fluently when he returned to London to carry the colours of his battalion. The sudden death of his elder brother whilst he was yet under age made him heir to the petty principality, and he resigned his commission at his father's call; but only to serve soon after in the field under the sovereign whose uniform he had put off. The claim of Maria Theresa to the throne of Austria threw all Europe into a blaze. As France supported her rival, the Elector of Bavaria, England naturally espoused the cause of the brave young Queen of Hungary; and George II. took the field on the Main at the head of a large force composed chiefly of English and Hanoverians, but having in it a Dutch contingent commanded by the Count of Lippe, whose son gained permission to see service by his father's side. The British monarch, though a brave man himself, was a poor strategist, and had scarce been in command a week when his army was in imminent danger of having its supplies altogether cut off by Noailles, who was operating against it with a superior force of French on the other side of the Main. Fortunately for the king, his movement of retreat from a very awkward position did not discourage his own troops, whilst it led to a sudden passage of the stream by the French, and a rash attempt to intercept his army altogether, which brought on the battle of Dettingen. Never was the value of the old advice to build a bridge of gold for the retiring enemy more strikingly illustrated than when Noailles, instead of allowing his adversary to commence his retreat, and then pushing his rear through the defiles to the north by which he must escape, resolved to intercept

him. The narrow front of the action which ensued on the north bank proved more favourable to the steadiness with which the British received the attack than to the impetuosity with which the French delivered it. The young Count learnt that day a practical lesson in the advantage of good discipline under fire, which dwelt with him during the rest of a long and varied military career. Here too he showed the same contempt for danger which caused Count Schulemburg, under whom he afterwards served in Italy, to send him off on detachment before a general action, lest he should get himself killed to no purpose; and which, later, made his name a proverb for daring in the first part of the Seven Years' War.

That great conflict had not long been engaged when Portugal was drawn into it, on the side of her already old ally, the King of Great Britain and of Frederick the Great with whom his sympathies were engaged. As has invariably been found in like cases, the Portuguese army, on coming out of peace, was quite unfit for the field; and the little kingdom was in danger of being crushed by Spanish arms guided by France. Help was sought from England, and sent in the person of Count de la Lippe, now holding a commission as Hanoverian general, who was soon on his way to Lisbon with a staff of trained officers. Here his duties were those which Beresford was sent two generations later to repeat; and so successfully was the task performed, that to his exertions it was universally acknowledged the safety of the kingdom was due. The grateful king would willingly have retained him at his post of commander-in-chief when the war was over. But the Count had now succeeded to his father's sovereignty, and returned to Germany to devote himself to its duties with as much energy as though his few thousands of subjects had been as many millions. Although he saw war no more, he counted among the chief duties of a ruler the keeping his people thoroughly prepared for its event. The maxim he himself was never weary of teaching was, that since man has a natural inclination for war, this should be taken as the basis of national education, and properly directed. 'The study of military science,' so ran his favourite canon, 'is not the melancholy trade of discovering more skilful means of murder, but is the rendering a true service to humanity. For the more perfectly military science is studied, the more dangerous will it be found to commence a war, and the more rare consequently will war be; and when it does occur, the more removed from useless murder. The misuse of this higher art would carry us down to the level from whence it raised us. No war but a defensive one is justifiable, as the wantonly



‘offensive is utterly beneath the dignity of the just man. The preparation of means of defence will tend to limit war, inasmuch as they will constantly increase the obstacles that are put in the way of the invader.’ Words these which have a sound truth in them, that is illustrated by the general course of history, none the less surely, that national animosities or dynastic ambitions from time to time prove so strong as to outweigh all caution and defy all restraint.

True to his maxims, Count William carried them out to the full in his own dominions, and in his general devotion to the wellbeing of his subjects never forgot the supposed necessity of their military training. His means for an army were indeed limited. To maintain the single battalion of foot, squadron of horse, and battery of guns which formed his establishment, and which it was his pride to make models for all Germany, might not have been too heavy a tax on the adults of the principality, and its money resources. But if their complement of men was always full, it would yet exclude, as in other German states was then excluded, a great part of the males able to bear arms. The old Teuton law had prescribed that there should be no exemption from the defence of the country; but this had long fallen into disuse, and the system of standing armies of long service which had grown up all over Germany in its place, was too suited to the absolutist notions of the age to be lightly shaken. It was reserved for this sovereign of an obscure and petty principality, in his zeal for carrying out his theory of complete defence, to revive the old notion that the army of a state should be the people of the state in arms. And in pressing earnestly after his object, he was the first to solve the problem which now engages the attention of great empires, of achieving this maximum of warlike power with the least possible expense. The method taken for this end was that by which alone it has been anywhere accomplished. He insisted on each adult fit for arms serving long enough in the ranks to acquire a thorough knowledge of the arm to which he was assigned, and this attained, dismissed him from the colours, but under the liability to rejoin in case of war. Gneisenau, the ‘brains’ of the victorious army of Blücher in after days, and the most trusted soldier of Prussia when fate robbed her of Scharnhorst, felt and acknowledged to the full the obligation Germany owed to the memory of the man who had bequeathed her the secret of her sudden rise from abject prostration.

‘You have praised the Count of Lippe highly,’ he wrote to Varnhagen von Ense, ‘yet not as befits his merit. He was far greater than you re-

present him. I formerly stayed some time at his capital of Bückeburg, and read his manuscripts in the archives there. All our system of national armament, with its Landwehr and Landsturm, the whole modern method of making war, this man had thoroughly marked out; in its greatest conceptions and least particulars, he had known and practically taught it. Just think what sort of a man that must have been whose spirit could conceive thus far beforehand the vastest ideas of war, so that their realisation in later days actually shattered the whole power of Napoleon himself.'

It was not at his court residence of Bückeburg that the Count laboured to work his problems out by personal exertion in teaching those he desired to make perfect soldiers. The very interest which he always gave when there to the civil government of the state, and his intense devotion to a childless yet adored wife, would have hampered him in his task of instructing individually the staff and recruits of his model force. In the long plain through which the Weser works its sluggish way to the ocean, there are moors and waste lands better suited for such a purpose than for agriculture; and none more so than that surrounding the Steinhuder Lake, one of the large shallow inland waters of north-western Germany. The southern shore of this belonged to the principality, whose inhabitants had from time immemorial claimed the sole right of fishing in its waters, a claim in rougher days often supported by force of arms against their opposite neighbours who were subjects of Hanover. Here then, soon after his return from Portugal, the Count began large works, intended at once to carry out his favourite vision of a perfect military academy, and to supply an additional fortress for the defence of the empire. Foundations were carried out into the lake; fortifications and buildings rose upon them; and a few years of patient toil soon erected in the waste a strong place of arms, with ample storehouses and barracks, and above all, spacious apartments to serve as the lecture-room, chapel, and library of a great military school. Paintings expressive of discipline and instruction adorned the walls, and on them the Count himself wrote, in large characters, his favourite motto, 'The palm belongs not to the victor, but to the victor who wins it nobly.' Once erected, the new academy was supplied with teachers brought from all parts of Germany, and even of France, and with instruments and models of all sorts needed for the pupils. A section devoted to the artillery and engineering studies, which were then in comparative infancy, was watched over by the Count with especial care. He himself undertook the mathematical lectures necessary; and no branch of study that the best taught officers of scientific corps follow at the present

day was omitted in the instruction of the cadets of Wilhelmstein under this ardent military reformer of a hundred years ago. If Germany was the first of great nations to direct the use of military history for scientific ends; to insist on the military engineer being thoroughly acquainted with civil architecture, the artilleryman with the higher laws of projectiles, and the staff officer with topography and modern languages; she owes it, as she owes the early development of her system of national armament, to Count William of Lippe and the school of thoughtful soldiers he reared in days of profound peace on the remote Steinhuder Lake. And of these the most distinguished, the subject of this memoir, who more than any other of his pupils profited by the teaching of the Count, bore special testimony, long after, that his devotion to military science was never suffered to interfere with his duties as ruler.

'Seldom have there been united,' wrote Scharnhorst of his old preceptor soon after his death, 'such entire goodness of heart with so many great qualities of spirit. He never left the distressed without succour, nor the widow and orphan without care for their condition. Every expense of his small court was cut down that he might enjoy the one happiness of making others happy. Towards those about him he was ever pleasant and courteous. In his school he was at once 'organiser, inspector, benefactor, and friend. He made many a young man happy, and his lessons are already bearing fruit.'

In these last words Scharnhorst modestly indicated other men then better known than himself, but they were prophetic above all as applied to the great part the writer was destined to play in the regeneration of Germany.

Gerhard Scharnhorst was not a subject of the Count's to whose teaching he owed so much. His father, a humble yeoman of Hanover, had inherited a small property in the neighbourhood of the Steinhuder Lake, which was not however handed over to him until a series of lawsuits had been waged that extended over ten years and a half, during which his family were growing up. Often on the point of obtaining possession of this estate, and often disappointed, he sought to give his eldest son 'an education better fitted for his prospects than his present position, and Gerhard's first instruction in the village school was aided by lessons from a half-pay captain living near, one of the many veterans whom the close of the Seven Years' War had sent into private life. Distinguished early for bodily strength and activity, the boy showed equal aptitude for his books, and soon mastered the moderate course of mathematics which it was in the power of his tutor to impart. His father's coming into possession of the long-expected estate brought the

family into the vicinity of the academy Count William watched over so carefully. The zeal and diligence with which the elder Scharnhorst was seen to be restoring the value of the property, neglected during the long lawsuit, brought him to the notice of the Count, who was only less devoted to agricultural improvements than to military science: and the acquaintance once made, the step was natural that offered his eldest son, then a youth of eighteen, and inspired by his old teacher with earnest longing to be a soldier, a place in the cadet corps gathered at Wilhelmstein. The favour was gladly accepted by young Gerhard, with his father's approval, and thenceforward his path in life was marked out. Nature had gifted him with every quality of mind and body the soldier can desire, and it only needed opportunity to make him eminent in the profession for which no youth of that generation could have had a better training. Before the close of 1773, the second year of his father's possession of his property, young Scharnhorst was fairly enrolled on the Wilhelmstein establishment, and had begun his new career.

The times were eminently peaceful. Exhausted by the terrible struggle of the Seven Years' War, Europe was passing through one of those periods of tranquillity when dreamers believe that the nature of the race is wholly changing, and the sword about to be beaten for ever into a pruning hook. Frederick's own last campaign had been a mere parade into Bohemia, ended by him abruptly in a peace, without measuring his strength in a single battle. At such times it is forgotten that nations have passions fierce as those of individuals and far less controllable, and that the experience of past suffering is no more, in one case than the other, a guarantee for perfect abstinence from quarrels in the future. At such times too, ordinary rulers are apt to neglect that very military art by which they have seen nations made great or preserved free: for it needs special devotion to it for its own sake to prevent the arm from rusting for which there seems no possibility of present use. Count William, however, was not one of these. From year to year he steadily pursued his design of training up such a band of perfect officers as might leaven the whole services of Germany; and among his favourite cadets was naturally young Scharnhorst, whose manly bearing and quick parts had attracted special notice soon after his admission to the classes. The Count watched over each step in his career with interest, took an early opportunity of promoting him to an acting commission as a sub-lieutenant of engineers, and lost no opportunity of encouraging him to enter

thoroughly on the highest studies that his profession offered. But ere Scharnhorst's course was complete according to the high standard fixed by the founder of Wilhelmstein, an unexpected change came over the busy little school. The sudden death in 1776 of the wife to whom Count William was attached with all the fervour of his nature, the sharer of all his interests and the companion of the adventurous career of his youth, fairly broke that strong heart in the truest sense of the word. He gave himself up to uncontrolled and absorbing grief; took no further care of his favourite pursuits, his people, or his school; and shutting himself off from all occupation or society, in a very few months followed to the grave the woman without whom life was for him not worth the living. His sovereignty passed to a distant relative who cared for none of his predecessor's designs, and the cadets of Wilhelmstein were dispersed to their homes, to make their own way in the world as they could. Scharnhorst's college reputation stood so high that he had no difficulty in obtaining his first request, a commission in the Hanoverian service; and in 1778 his commission from George III. came over, and he found himself a cornet in the Eighth Dragoons. Here, however, an unexpected obstacle arose. The new sovereign of Schaumburg-Lippe, as soon as he heard of the nomination, showed an unexpected desire to retain the young officer Count William had favoured, and positively refused him permission to resign his engineer's commission in the army that now only existed on paper. General Estorff, the colonel of his new regiment, took up Scharnhorst's cause in vain, the Count receiving all applications in obstinate silence. It needed higher intervention to free him from his temporary allegiance; and this came at last from Field Marshal von Hardenberg, who commanded King George's German forces. A very plain statement of the circumstances was laid before this veteran by General Estorff, showing that young Scharnhorst was by birth a Hanoverian, and by the fact of the dissolution of the Bückeburg school and the dismissal of its staff, restored legally to his proper sovereign; and the Marshal addressed at once a very strong remonstrance to the new Count, which procured the required official discharge, with a certificate added that Scharnhorst had borne an unblemished character during his five years' training under the late sovereign of the principality. The soldier to whom Germany was hereafter to owe so much donned the uniform of a Hanoverian cornet in October 1778, and took up his new duties with a detachment at Nordheim, not far from his father's estate.

For some years his life in his new service might well have been as little interesting as that of other cornets. Young officers fresh from the work of a military college are apt to give their brains a very full rest when entering on the comparatively free life of the regiment. But Scharnhorst never throughout life lost an opportunity of improving his own military knowledge and that of those around him, and he had not long joined the Eighth Dragoons when General Estorff, an officer devoted to his regiment, found in him the very man he had long looked for to conduct a school established by himself for the instruction of the younger officers and corporals. The aim in this was of necessity of a humble character, corresponding to the moderate attainments of the pupils. Of one cornet it stands recorded that when he applied for an exchange into the Prussian service, it was endorsed on his letter by the commanding officer through whom it passed, that the candidate had resorted to the village schoolmaster to prepare it, 'being unaccustomed to write in 'his own hand.' This was in the year before Scharnhorst joined the regiment. Space would fail us if we attempted to describe how the regimental instruction once placed under him, supported as his efforts were by the influence of General Estorff, became not only a wholesome reality, but a model for other corps, and made his name, though but that of a young subaltern, familiar throughout the Hanoverian service. When it was resolved a few years later to establish at Hanover a finishing artillery school, the teaching of which was avowedly to follow that of the deceased Count of Lippe's Academy, Colonel Trew, to whom the task was confided, sought and obtained the assistance of the Count's favourite pupil, and Scharnhorst was transferred to the new establishment, with a fresh commission as sub-lieutenant of artillery. This was in 1782, and for the ten years that followed his life was devoted to the task of utilising for the Hanoverian service the teachings of Wilhelmstein, enlarged by his own constant course of professional studies. These led him naturally into military literature, and his incessant activity in this new field is shown by the list of his works during this period. His 'Hand-Book for Officers,' a work held as a classic of the profession in German armies, was followed by a 'History of the Siege of Gibraltar,' a 'Commentary on Gustavus Adolphus's Military System,' a 'Military Pocket-Book for Use in the Field,' and the well-known 'Instructions of the King of Prussia to his Generals,' which have been translated into all the chief European languages, and form a portion of every standard military library. These more serious undertakings of his ten years' professor-

ship never interfered with his regular course of teaching. A vast mass of original lectures are recorded as having been delivered by him during his tenure of office, comprising not only the details of artillery, and of its sister service of engineering, but entering into every part of tactics, and into the moral elements in war. Every now and then he introduced a skilful defence of the advantages of that scientific training, which in every military body to which it has been attempted to apply it, has found detractors. Such opponents human nature has raised to the Scharnhorsts of all armies, from the time of that which gathered before Troy, if we may take the authority of the highest genius that has portrayed the failings of our race. Shakspeare puts into the mouth of Ulysses the old complaint against such adversaries of science:—

‘ They tax our policy, and call it cowardice ;  
 Count wisdom as no member of the war ;  
 Forestall prescience, and esteem no act  
 But that of hand : the still and mental parts,  
 That do contrive how many hands shall strike,  
 When fitness calls them on, and know by measure  
 Of their observant toil the enemies’ weight,—  
 Why, this hath not a finger’s dignity :  
 They call this bed-work, mappery, closet-war.’

No subject connected with his profession was left out of sight by the restless ability of the young professor; and this too without ever preventing him from maintaining his own separate course of study, or diminishing his literary activity. Never was there a better illustration of the profound saying that only busy men find time to study. Under his care the Artillery School at Hanover not only surpassed all others in Europe in the thoroughness of its teaching; but voluntary classes of from twenty to thirty officers of other branches regularly attending it, attested the popularity of the lecturer, and the desire then entertained, as now, by the best class of soldiers for the acquisition of professional knowledge.

Scharnhorst, however, with all his devotion to theory, would probably have been as little pleased as any soldier that ever lived to pass his whole life in mere instruction; and it is fair to believe that he hailed the opening of a new career, when the War of the French Revolution terminated the interval of peace in which Germany had slumbered, her general tranquillity being little disturbed by the distant contest in America, in which France and Spain had as of old taken part against England. It would be beside our purpose to follow the course of events that led to the first coalition against France, and

caused the King of Great Britain and Elector of Hapover to take a leading part in it. From the first it was evident that the well-trained troops of the Electorate would be among the earliest sent into the field. The contingent with whose teaching Scharnhorst had been so long largely entrusted, was ordered to march into the Netherlands, and join the force coming from England in detachments under the Duke of York. At his own request, for he burnt to prove his fitness for the field duties he had hitherto shared only in summer exercises, went the ex-professor of the Artillery School, posted as senior lieutenant of the single troop of horse artillery which the Hanoverian general, Count Wallinoden, took with him.

Did we stay here to compare the two portions of King George's army which met under York on the French frontier, the examination would be little flattering to English pride. Von Sybel's cold and severe pages show but too faithfully the undisciplined state of the English regiments that were hastily sent over, the reckless dissipation which their officers carried into camp life, and the want of sympathy between them and their men. Those who doubt a foreign writer's criticisms on such a subject, may satisfy themselves that the picture drawn by the German professor was not too severe, by a perusal of Sir Robert Wilson's Memoirs. A glance at his narrative of the campaign in Flanders will convince the most incredulous how completely the discipline of Fontenoy and Dettingen and Minden had vanished for the time from our service. It seemed as though the traditions of the orderly armies of William and Marlborough had vanished under the influence of American disasters. Those who knew not the latent fighting power of the island soldiery, must have expected little enough from a force in which the carelessness of the officers and recklessness of the soldiery was only matched by the ignorance of the staff and the incompleteness of the equipments. Like the other branches, the artillery was far behind in the latter, and the raw drivers assigned it were hardly fit to accompany a waggon-train into the field. It is not surprising therefore to learn that the noble service of to-day owes much to the example of the batteries that came from Hanover, an influence acknowledged, though but scantily, in Major Duncan's recent 'History of the Royal Artillery.'

The armies joined on the French frontier entered it with ease, for the crushing defeat suffered by Dumouriez at Neerwinden had cleared Belgium of the invaders as completely as Waterloo did twenty-two years later; and for a time all seemed favourable to the coalition. Scharnhorst's history for a brief



space seems lost in that of the crowd of allies who were driving back the armies of the Convention, and investing the French fortresses. But his opportunity for personal distinction soon came. In the attack on the camp of Famars, in May 1793, a contest chiefly of artillery, the Hanoverian horse battery contributed specially to the success of the allies by the rapidity and boldness with which it dashed forward to take the French guns in flank. And when the Duke of York made his single display of generalship in the not less successful turning of the new French position at Cæsar's Camp, near Valenciennes, in August, the same skill and boldness was shown in the pursuit by the 'Grey Gunners,' as Houchard's soldiers had named these active enemies from the colour of their tunics. Scharnhorst's energy and skill, and the important services of his battery, were recognised at once by his receiving the brevet rank of captain, soon converted into a more genuine commission on Wallmoden's application; and he was assigned the command of a second troop of horse artillery which was ordered to be formed forthwith in the field.

In his new position he had soon the opportunity in which a regimental officer can best show high qualities for war, a personal share in the covering a retreat. The tide began to turn against the allies. Why this change occurred towards the close of 1793; how far the division of councils among the allies, due mainly to the tortuous policy of Austria in her Belgian possessions, and her unwillingness to be dictated to by England as to their future, contributed to the result; how far the increased energy of France under pressure of the Committee of Public Safety, guided by Carnot's strategic insight; or whether the Duke of Brunswick was not bribed to make his extraordinary retreat; these are questions we cannot stay to discuss. Disasters now began to fall on the allies in their turn, and the new phase of affairs was first marked by the Battle of Hondschote. The brunt of the affair fell on Count Wallmoden's corps, and in the retreat that followed Scharnhorst's ubiquitous battery was so conspicuously active that the lasting favour of the old Hanoverian general was thenceforward conferred on its commander.

The pause that succeeded before the more decided successes of the French in 1794, was spent by Scharnhorst chiefly in the vicinity of the small fortress of Menin, and led to a feat of arms the most brilliant of its kind in modern, perhaps in any history. It stands out, this subsequent exploit of his, conspicuous as a striking proof that no officer, in time of war especially, should neglect that important part of his profession, the study

of the country in which he is engaged. His station and rank were not so high at this time as to impose on him any special responsibility; but he used his time with all the diligence that was natural to him, and mastered the details of every possible problem that the surrounding circumstances, and the district occupied, the Valley of the Lys, could offer for solution. His studies were soon put to a severe and practical test, when Pichegru in April concentrated the bulk of his forces in the district to the south of the Lys, and advanced into West Flanders to break through the allied line of defence. Wallmoden had been stripped of a part of his command not long before, in order to strengthen that of the Austrian General, Clairfayt. He had in vain reported to the King the dangerous extension of his line, which the mistaken strategy of covering every little town imposed. He was forced to fall back abruptly; the allied line was broken; and the process went on under which the largest armies of that time when in retreat rapidly dissolved, of throwing detachments into all the fortified places near. It was the conventional habit to do this, leaving them to be invested; and it was the conventional habit also for those thus abandoned to stand a certain amount of siege attack before surrendering, thus serving certainly to delay somewhat the enemy's pursuit. Thus one immediate result of Wallmoden's retreat was to leave a Hanoverian force of 2,000 men under Major-general Hammerstein shut up in Menin, with Scharnhorst for their chief of artillery.

The place as a fortress was insignificant. Such strength as it possessed was due to the diligence with which Scharnhorst had laboured to extend the works during the spring. It gives a curious view of the feebleness with which this war was conducted by those most concerned, to learn that it had required representations to be made through Wallmoden to the authorities at London and Vienna, before leave could be obtained to take possession of a small hill outside, on which Scharnhorst judged it was essential to place an earthwork; so careful were the allies of the feelings of the Belgians. War carried on in this fashion against the vigorous generals of the Republic, the famous Moreau himself being in command of Pichegru's advance, was conducted at long odds; and Hammerstein and his chief of artillery were not long in making up their minds that all hope of relief from outside was gone, and a prolonged defence impossible. Thirteen thousand men were placed in position for the investment, and heavy guns brought up. Ammunition within the place was scanty, notwithstanding that urgent demands for it had been repeated for months past. The first day's

bombardment showed the vast superiority of the enemy's fire, and made the end certain, however brave the resistance might prove. The third day brought a summons which was sternly repelled. The night of the fourth, April 29th, found General Hammerstein, after a brief address to his chief officers, forming his little force under cover of the darkness, to cut his way out. The task was all the more difficult since an inundation of the Lys, formed to protect a part of the enceinte, made egress only possible on one side, on which the bulk of the investing force was naturally concentrated. But the general was by nature a brave man; his troops were loyal to him; he had under him, too, a body of four hundred French emigrants in British pay, to whom capture meant death; and, above all, in this undertaking he placed implicit reliance on the guidance of Scharnhorst, who literally knew the country so that he could have crossed it blindfold, and who never left his commander's side.

Into the details of this night march we do not purpose to enter. It became all the more difficult to execute when the first attempt to sally out was met and repulsed; and the column, when it tried another opening, was encumbered by some field guns, which it was judged absolutely necessary to bring, in case the foe had barricaded the few roads. The fighting was sharp, and the confusion of course terrible; but the attempt in the end completely succeeded, and by four in the morning Hammerstein was calling the roll of his force in the market-place of Rouselaer, a village far beyond the French lines, and despatching a hasty line to Wallmoden to report his success.

The garrison of Menin had done its first duty in delaying Moreau and his troops sufficiently. It had been looked on at the allied head-quarters as a rearguard purposely sacrificed for a special object. The weakness of the place was so notorious that it was generally believed the French would carry it by storm, and put its defenders to the sword. And hence the news that they had cut their way out of the midst of the foe with trifling loss, came as a real ray of light in the gloom spread by the general movement of retreat which presaged but too surely a long train of disasters to follow. Honours and compliments flowed in on Hammerstein. Clairfayt, by far the best of the Allied commanders, who the following year redeemed the discredit of the Austrian abandonment of Belgium to Jourdan and Pichegru, by a splendid triumph over their united armies on the Rhine, was the first to write his formal congratulations to the Major-general. The Emperor Francis, who was then in the Netherlands, promptly followed with his

own in an autographic letter. And when Wallmoden's report reached St. James's, with the pertinent comment of the veteran that no such deed of arms had been performed for fifty years before, King George's own thanks were sent to the brave commander, and a special postscript in the reply to the official despatch named Scharnhorst, 'whose talents, activity, and presence 'of mind' Hammerstein had declared he could not sufficiently praise, a major by special brevet, a very rare honour in those days, and appointed him to the general staff of the army, as assistant quarter-master general of the Hanoverian Contingent.

The separation of the Allied armies had now begun which followed too certainly their continued movement rearward. Austria, wearied as she said of sacrifices made for the ungrateful Belgians, resolved to abandon the Low Countries, and began to draw her forces eastwards to the Rhine. The Duke of York on his side, anxious not to be severed from the sea, the natural base of a British force upon the Continent, and willing to protect Holland as long as possible, fell back northward on that country. Thus the Allied line was soon stretched until it parted. The Republicans poured into the gap those hordes which a single defeat like that of Neerwinden would have dissolved once more, but which were formidable enough when in unchecked advance. Vigour and superior numbers now atoned with them for many military deficiencies. On either side they thrust their parted adversaries back, and whilst Jourdan was forcing the Austrians towards the Rhine, Pichegru followed York into Holland, and began to wrest it from him. Long dark hours of retreat followed for the Anglo-Hanoverians, broken by sharp skirmishes, and marked by acts of bravery and scenes of suffering, as natural the one to the courage of the British, as the other to their ill discipline. In one of the sharpest of these rear-guard affairs, the action of Boxel, Arthur Wellesley, then colonel of the 33rd, first became known as an officer of singular readiness and courage, and proved thus early in his career what gallant stuff the British infantry have in them when well led, be their circumstances ever so depressing.

Wearied of his hopeless task, their royal commander-in-chief at last resigned his charge to Wallmoden, and left for England, the retreat still continuing towards the eastern frontier of Holland. But with all the *élan* that the French began to show under the influence of continued advance, they never seriously entangled their retreating foes, nor obtained any one striking success. That the retreat was thus honourable, that the strategy of the Allied force was so accurately studied that no point of vantage was ever won in their oft-

changed line, those who study the reports of Scharnhorst brought to light by Herr Klippel's industry will fully acknowledge to have been due to the unremitting energy and correct *coup d'œil* of the Hanoverian Major commissioned by King George, whom many a worthy Prussian to this day believes to have been born and bred his countryman, and trained solely in the great army which he inspired with new life in his later years.

The period of peace that followed is a dark blot on the history of Prussian policy. Never did a great Power stoop so low to purchase neutrality. Never did neutrality prove more ruinous. But if the dishonour fell on the kingdom ruled by Frederick William and his counsellors, the trial was not less that of Hanover, whose fate was of necessity bound up with that of her more powerful neighbour. Protected at first by Prussian guarantee, she was later occupied forcibly by Prussian troops under the pretence of reprisals for the high-handed dealings of Great Britain with neutral ships. This hostile attitude ceased however on the death of the Emperor Paul, whose change of the policy of St. Petersburg in favour of the First Consul had forced on that of Berlin this quarrel with Prussia's ancient ally. Meanwhile Scharnhorst, now a colonel and at the head of the Quartermaster-General's staff, had full room to gratify his favourite desire of educating those on whom the little army must depend hereafter; and to his personal training was due the excellence of the framework on which was built the King's German Legion, which in later years did such splendid service under Wellington. But as the ever-advancing frontier of France extended across the Rhine, and her master began more and more to rule the policy of the German states, the situation of Hanover, threatened constantly by the unceasing advances of Napoleon, and dependent for freedom on the shifting protection of Prussia, became more and more intolerable. All thoughtful men in her service could see that the time must come when French annexation or French occupation in some shape would be her fate. They could see too that the truckling policy of Frederick William could hardly keep Prussia for ever from her natural part of champion of Germany. Her present imbecility could not wholly obscure the memory of the proud position the kingdom had held under Frederick the Great, nor of the checks her arms then administered to French ambition. And the Court of Berlin, whilst as anxious to avoid hostilities with the Consulate as with the Republic it had superseded, was not wholly blind to the necessity of providing against future attack. So that it

is not surprising that Scharnhorst, now as distinguished for practical skill in the field as for his educational powers, received pressing invitations to transfer his services to the Prussian staff. These offers came as early as 1797; but it was not until four years had passed, and all hope of the Hanoverian army taking the field again as an independent force was extinct, that he asked for the necessary permission, and with Wallmoden's sanction left the work he had so long been engaged in for a larger sphere at Berlin. 'His teaching,' wrote Sir Julius Härtmann, one of his favourite pupils, many years after, 'was based on a simple and sound knowledge of men. In opposition to the wanton exuberance of such theorists as Bülow, he brought facts into full clear light, and drew from them plain rules for practice. Thoroughly acquainted with the highest results of technical art, he ever regarded them as only so far useful as they could be made to accord with the necessities of war. Soundness, sobriety, and coolness were his leading characteristics, as those of all his instruction of the Hanoverian body of officers. These led him to the high practical powers that he displayed in his own great career, as his pupils owe to them such distinction as they gained in the English service.' Such was the future guide which the course of circumstances was to give the Prussian army, though it needed the bitter teachings of adversity to prepare the way for the acceptance of his lessons.

In his new service Scharnhorst soon discovered how paralysed the efforts of the military reformer are in time of peace by the dead weight of routine and prejudice resting on the traditions of the past. We have seen of late, in the fall of a neighbouring empire, the same story closely repeated that may be found in Prussian history during the first six years of this century. No warning that Scharnhorst, or others who thought with him, gave, could have been more full of truth than those that Trochu, Ducrot, Stoffel, poured into the deaf ears of the men that ruled France under the Second Empire. But in all countries the instinctive conservatism that hates change suggested by a foreign model is intensified by the members of every profession, and above all in the military caste. Frederick himself began no reforms until he had fled away ingloriously from Mollwitz under the belief that his first great battle was lost. And those who ruled at Berlin seventy years since, as those who governed France but recently, in answer to all warnings that a foreign Power was steadily advancing in the art of war to the danger of her rivals, thought it enough to say, 'Did we not beat these Frenchmen (or these Germans) with

'ease in our old era of victory? Why should we trouble ourselves to imitate their new-fangled ideas now?' Frederick the Great's campaigns proved in fact to his successors in the years before Jena, what Napoleon the Great's were to the Second Empire: why should we not add, what the Peninsula and Waterloo have often threatened to be to ourselves? So Scharnhorst, though soon entrusted with the teaching of a small section of the Berlin staff, had no practical power over it for good beyond the effect of his personal influence on a few pupils during the five years that followed his arrival at the head-quarters of the Prussian army. Then at last came the crisis which was in the end to make him not merely the regenerator of the service of his adoption, but one of the truest founders of the modern German Empire. If not made wholly by 'blood and iron,' at least it will be confessed that this great monarchy could hardly have come into being without them; and the sword that triumphed at Sadowa and Sedan was sharpened by his hand in that hour of Prussia's direst need which followed her overthrow at Jena.

It was our task some years ago to write in these pages\* the story of the campaign of 1806, and to explain the collapse of that system which had served Frederick so admirably before the shock of the new tactics. He had framed it in advance of the ideas of his age: his successors pleaded his memory as their excuse for preserving it unimproved. The great king whom they professed to make their model would have been the last man to be thus taken at a disadvantage. But the military guides of Prussia under Frederick William III. were no wiser than her political leaders. And as the latter, in what seemed a fit of national imbecility, allowed the favourable moment to go by when the kingdom might have entered the lists against the French Empire with some hope of success, before Austria was subjugated and Russia driven from the field, so the Berlin War Office took no note of the means which had made French strategy so successful for invasion, and French tactics so rapid in their blows. Not that these things escaped Scharnhorst's keen view. But his influence, when he was removed to Berlin, proved, as has been already stated, hardly greater than that his writings had gained for him when he was at a distance from the vacillating court. Personal jealousy indeed now stood greatly in his way. The fact of his transfer into the Prussian artillery with his rank of lieutenant-colonel roused animosity against him on the part of those he was said to supersede, for Frederick

---

\* Edin. Review, Jan. 1866, 'Recent Changes in the Art of War.'

William's field officers were as little tolerant of such an act of their sovereign as though they had belonged to a constitutionally governed army in the reign of Queen Victoria. Many years after Scharnhorst's death, when the nation acknowledged his services with heartfelt gratitude, and the name of the Hanoverian officer was enrolled with the most distinguished in Prussian annals, veterans were heard to murmur that so unprecedented an act had never been known in their service as the violation of routine that accompanied his entrance in her army list. And far from finding sympathy among the higher officers who were not thus personally affected, Scharnhorst had to experience their coldness, varied often by open hostility. The provincial accent which testified to his rural birth, the stoop which long labour at the desk had imparted to his sinewy frame, his zeal for enlarging theoretical knowledge in the service which knew no practice but that of peace; all these were made charges against the new comer. Pedant they called him, and would-be schoolmaster, these chiefs of an army which had been learning nothing, and yet believed there was nothing for it to learn. His very studies were a reproach to the mass who regarded their profession as one to which Prussian officers had an hereditary key that those of no other nationality could turn, and her army as a finished machine that no mortal could improve on without risking sacrilege. Frederick the Great's worst enemies could have desired no better revenge for their defeats than to know that a new generation of Prussian soldiers would allow the weight of his authority to clog all progress when he had passed away. It would seem, in short, as if at that time the spirit ruled supreme over Berlin military administration which is apt to beset that of any nation, however glorious its former annals, when peace is chosen for safety's sake without care for honour; a dull belief among those in high places that after all an army is chiefly an official ornament of state, a creature for parades and shows, a toy to please the prince's eye or the people's, rather than a rough instrument wherewith to work out the policy, or defend the life, of the country. Of such an error France is now paying the penalty, as Prussia paid it during Scharnhorst's life. But it springs from causes that lie in human nature, and its workings may be traced in other capitals than Paris and Berlin.

Frederick William was wiser than those who would have advised him in this matter. As he had himself sought to gain Scharnhorst for his army, so he favoured him as much, and gave him as much opportunity for influence, as the conventional trammels that surrounded Prussian royalty allowed. Placed



soon after his arrival in Berlin in charge of part of the instruction at the War Academy for young officers, he devoted himself more and more to it as he found his efforts as a reformer of his own special arm, the artillery, shattered against the obstinacy of the senior officers of that branch; a body as conservative in their way as those of our own time at Berlin or Woolwich notoriously are. It may seem strange that a service that has so much concern with theory should be found of all the most opposed to change. But the reason is simple enough. The very pains bestowed on the training of artillery officers in all modern armies are apt to make commonplace men think that they and the service they belong to have reached the acme of professional skill, and hence to resent any proposal for improvement as an insult to their own knowledge. Against the objections of Tempelhof, whose own literary fame only made him the more envious, it is said, of the Hanoverian essayist, and of others at the head of the artillery regiments, Scharnhorst's schemes had no prospect of success. But the teaching power which he developed at the War Academy in what had been at first but a secondary duty gradually won its acceptance there, and led to his being first recognised as the chief instructor, and soon afterwards made its director. Frederick William was not content with merely having brought the Hanoverian writer and teacher to Berlin. Scharnhorst's calm but earnest devotion to the duties that were assigned him, made the king who watched it feel his superiority to the bigots that sneered at his innovations; and in 1804, when he had been three years in Prussia, the royal approval was given to his scheme for the complete remodelling of the instruction of young officers, and a grant made to carry it out. General Geusau, the veteran Quarter-Master-General, one of those of his profession who regarded the Hanoverian reformer very much as a peer of ancient family looks on a Red Republican, had the nominal charge of the institution. To him it fell therefore to receive with ill grace enough the royal rescript which stated the high appreciation the king entertained of the plans of Scharnhorst, and directed that they should be absolutely adopted. Another mark of Frederick William's regard which had been shown some time before by a patent enrolling him among the Prussian order of nobility, had served but to increase the envy with which his exceptional position among the officers of artillery was regarded by the seniors of that arm. This led at last to his soliciting in a personal audience his transfer from it; and the king's reply was a brevet which conferred on him the rank of colonel on the staff, and assigned him the post of

Deputy Quarter-Master-General of the army, an honour which was the more appropriate as conferred just at the time when the little force to the improvement of which he had devoted the earlier years of his life was dissolved, on the seizure of Hanover by the French, and his former comrades had to resign their military calling, or to seek a distant revenge for the humiliation of the electorate by offering their services in the German Legion which England took the occasion to raise. Thenceforward Scharnhorst was bound to Frederick William by a personal tie of gratitude such as only natures of warm impulse and generous feelings can know. He looked on Prussia as the country of his adoption, and gave her monarch the full treasures of a loyal heart. And during the dark days that followed, country and king had no more patriotic servant than the son of the Hanoverian yeoman, whose first honours had been won when following the British standard.

During the brief interval of peace that followed his promotion, Scharnhorst had under his care a third part of the general staff of the army, and did what in him lay to awaken in it that farsighted prescience which in our time all recognise as the guiding spirit of the Prussian service. But his seniors in the department under Geusau, Colonels Phull and Massenbach, historical characters for their respective failures in the campaigns that followed, had the ear of their chief, and were in their several ways hostile to his efforts. Theorists both, they objected to any theories but their own, and especially to Scharnhorst's favourite view of war, which was that the ideal can never be applied to it without large allowances for human fallibility, and for the friction of the most complicated machine that man employs. But if in the staff itself his influence was therefore necessarily limited, his activity found a constant field in working for the Military Society, an association of officers for mutual improvement, which he had founded when in the artillery, with the express object of studying for every branch of the service the just limits of theory and practice, and which, despite much opposition from the conservatives of the army, flourished from year to year until it numbered nearly two hundred members when the war with France came that hurried them into the field. To write for this as well as for the War Academy gave constant occupation to Scharnhorst's busy pen; and thus although this portion of his life was less marked than that spent at Hanover by works of standard value, it has bequeathed to the Prussian service a mass of occasional papers remarkable not less for their historical research than their brilliant illustration of sound principles. To give but one instance :

the view of Napoleon uttered long afterwards, that good strategy consists in 'dividing to move and concentrating to strike,' is to be found laid down with a clearness of proof to which it is difficult to add, in Scharnhorst's review of the famous essay of Bülow on Marengo, published in the Proceedings of the Military Society for 1802.

The interest with which theory was then debated in military circles at Berlin was but a symptom of the uneasiness with which the profession regarded the rapid progress of French arms on the continent. The power which soldiers of the old school had been brought up to despise; which had been crushed by Germans following the invincible standard of Marlborough; which was shamefully beaten by Prussia herself at Rosbach in their fathers' days within sight of that historic plain round Leipsic where Gustavus first taught the Protestant warriors of Northern Europe to conquer, now seemed, in the new life given her by revolution, to find no equal anywhere. Switzerland, the Low Countries, Italy, the Rhine Valley, had become one after the other absorbed in her growing frontier. Her arm extending into Hanover threatened Prussia on the western border; and now advancing into the heart of Southern Germany under her new Emperor, more boldly than Moreau had dared even after his greatest victory, she was threatening to overrun Austria, undismayed by the fact that the unknown strength of the Muscovite was arrayed on the side of the invaded monarchy. Meanwhile Prussia, under the blind leadership of such timeserving statesmen as Haugwitz, was swayed forwards and backwards in her counsels, as fear of Napoleon alternated with the desire to strike in against him by the side of her bolder neighbours. In vain had Alexander himself visited Berlin, and at dead of night embraced in the king's presence the sarcophagus that held the remains of the Great Frederick. In vain had Francis despatched his brother on a special mission to implore Frederick William to forget the traditional jealousies of Berlin and Vienna and unite with him in one decisive blow against the Gaul. Nothing could serve to bring the Prussian court to decision. Uneasily observant and yet motionless, it had seen the violent occupation of Hanover by French troops, followed by the ominous arming of the frontier fortress of Hameln, which could serve against no other power but its own. It now stooped to receive the meagre compensation of six thousand pounds sterling offered by Napoleon for the violation of Prussian territory by Bernadotte's corps, when that general swept round towards the Danube in the movement that en-

closed Mack's army as with a net. • It sent Haugwitz at last to promise help to the allies, an ambassador who purposely delayed on his way until the fate of the campaign he was to have influenced was decided. Under the pretence of keeping his own person in security, this miserable betrayer of German interests passed on from the French head-quarters in Moravia to Vienna; and the fate of Austria was sealed four days later by the battle of Austerlitz, which left him to treat alone with the victor, for the alliance that Prussia had too late resolved to join was now severed by the sword. With scarcely concealed contempt Napoleon signed a provisional treaty with the envoy which gave his master Hanover as the bait for a French alliance; and after much hesitation the king confirmed the shameful compact, the avowed object of which was to shut Prussia's old ally out of the whole North of Europe,\* and its price the spoliation of her king's hereditary dominions. In vain did Fox protest in indignant tones against this act of treachery and cowardice, and declare that Great Britain never would consent to the transfer of the people of Hanover from one master to another like a flock of sheep. The deed of shame was consummated. Prussia once more occupied with armed force the soil she had promised to protect, and Napoleon, just then bent on finishing his work with Austria, received Frederick William's acquiescence with such show of friendliness that the blinded envoy who had brought his master into the snare wrote from Paris that all danger from France was past. So great was the influence of Haugwitz, or so strong the pressure for economy at Berlin, that this news was the signal for the abandonment of all the preparations made for national defence, or for a share in the struggle of Europe against French domination. The army was reduced to forty-eight battalions, nearly half of which garrisoned Hanover, and the strengthening and victualling of the fortresses was abruptly suspended.

This was in January 1806, scarcely two months after Austerlitz had decided Prussia's wavering policy. The king seems at this time to have sincerely trusted to Napoleon's good faith, and the people acquiesced unwillingly in their ruler's choice. But when a little later the dictator of Europe threw off the mask, and cynically offered in new negotiations with England to give her back the very electorate with which he had bribed Prussia against her, the shameful truth stood plainly revealed. The nation, which still prided itself in the memories of victory won against banded Europe; which half a century before had counted France as but one of many opponents defied and overthrown; now found itself, without striking

a blow, treated as the mere vassal of a French monarch. King and people alike gave way to a burst of passionate indignation. Frederick William decided at once for war, for such hesitation as may yet have lingered in his breast vanished in the excitement of seeing his people cry as one man for vengeance on the insulter. To have stayed any longer the national passion that flamed out all the fiercer for long restraint, would have been as dangerous to his crown as the worst peril war could bring; and 'war at any cost' was the response his proclamation gave to the universal call for action. Prussia, despite the obvious danger that faced her, for a brief space was as convulsed with joy as though certain victory was in her grasp. The theatres were thronged with crowds that stayed the performance of Schiller's '*Jungfrau von Orleans*' with their vociferous plaudits of each patriotic verse. The army, confident in proud traditions, and sure of the goodness of the cause in which it was to strike, was in a phrenzy of delight at the prospect of taking the field. But there were those among it who knew it for what it was, the mere dry bones of Frederick's invincible host. And Scharnhorst, above all, clear in his military vision, and viewing things round him with less prejudice than any born Prussian could, measured its exact worth for the struggle with painful truth.

'You write me,' were the despondent words he addressed to his son (who after the Jena catastrophe escaped to England to take service there against the French), not long before war became certain, 'you cannot stifle the wish to fight with us. The feeling is honourable to your spirit and patriotism. But learn, my son, to conquer these virtues in your early years. They have constantly, and especially at the present moment, been to me the very heaviest of burdens. For the rest, it is not my wish that you should take service as a soldier. You would find little satisfaction here. You would not like to serve the French. The other armies are for the most part in such condition that there is little honour to be reaped with any of them. On the one side are age, weakness, imbecility, ignorance, and want of dash; on the other all is activity and determination. It is true that the Prussian army is animated by a fine spirit, nor does it fail in courage or careful training. But it will not, it cannot, handled as it is and will be, do anything great or decisive. That is my conviction, which I would not reveal to you, a young man, did I not in writing this, conjure up before me the image of the son I most dearly love, whom I would willingly guide safely in his career.'

When such a soldier wrote thus: when such another as Gneisenau (*Pertz's Leben*, I. 114) declared about the same time, 'as I view the unsoldierly spirit of officers and men, their want of aptitude for war, their faith in antiquated

‘evolutions, their struggles against necessary reforms, and their unwillingness to follow the spirit of the age, I can foretell well enough what the end will be;’ it is hardly necessary to look more deeply for the causes of the ruin that befell those who went forth trusting in the prestige bequeathed by Frederick to encounter one greater far as a master of war than Frederick had ever been.

The shock was swift and terrible. A single skirmish, when the leader of the war party within the royal house, Prince Louis of Prussia, died under the sabre of an unknown serjeant of French hussars, was a fit presage of the slaughter that followed four days later. At two points Napoleon closed suddenly with the battalions which his skirmishers could run round, and the squadrons his cavalry could ride over. What chance had the horsemen who now filled the place of Ziethen’s cavaliers against the *furia Francese* their foe had skilfully revived, when their leaders were such men as the colonel Herr Klippel tells us of, who, when urged to lead a charge at the very crisis of Jena, replied that he was really too old now for any such rapid evolution? ‘In courage, I believe,’ wrote Scharnhorst in a hurried letter to his family, ‘our men were superior to the French. But the cavalry did not come up to expectation. And you remember I expected what the end would be.’ Prussia heard confusedly of an action which some called Jena and some Auerstadt, fought—no one knew why—to gain the passages of the Saal; and in a few hours more she learnt that the 130,000 soldiers who were to have guarded her from insult were flying like scattered sheep before the sword of the French, and her bosom laid bare to the conqueror. Dark indeed and shameful is the story that follows. If Scharnhorst’s genial nature could have allowed him to desire a fit revenge on those who had balked his efforts at reform, he might have had it to the full; for these soldiers of the good old school of Berlin seemed to vie with one another in the swiftness and ease with which they resigned their trusts. Massenbach himself, the critic who had scorned the theories of the Hanoverian yeoman that presumed to teach Prussian staff-officers their duty, and who had offered to surprise Napoleon by moving into Bavaria on principles modelled strictly after Frederick’s, won a specially evil distinction by his personal share in the surrender of the chief corps that escaped the field under Prince Hohenlohe. One bright episode alone illumined the shadow that fell on the whole Prussian army, and made what is now the model of all the officers of Europe for some years the butt of European scorn. Through the

worst days of retreat and humiliation we watch one heroic old soldier,\* distinguished already in earlier life as a rear-guard commander, who has rallied a few thousands of the fugitives, and is carrying them off through the rough district of the Hartz out of the victor's way. With a sort of instinct that here was their worst enemy, the French generals threw themselves on Blücher's track, and, with all the fierce energy inspired by their master, followed him with fivefold forces. Through day after day of wearying retreat the Prussian leader kept his men together by example and entreaty, rallied them again and again when ready to dissolve, and pressed northwards, he hardly knew whither, in the vain hope of saving the nucleus of a future army wherewith Prussia might renew the contest. And ever by Blücher's side we see a devoted staff-officer on whom he from the first relies, and who is as calm and unshaken in adversity as the old general is bold and energetic. Scharnhorst had been sharply wounded at Auerstadt, and separated from the head-quarter staff of which he formed a member; but with a soldier's true instinct he joined himself to the one true leader the fugitives found, nor ever left him until he himself fell into French hands as this last remnant of the defeated army was driven through the streets of Lubeck, when Blücher, stayed as it were by the waves of the Baltic, swallowed his rage at the surrender which became necessary not many hours later to save his men's lives. De Fezensac has told us of the disorder with which the pursuers poured across the plain of North Germany, plundering their way as they pressed on. Herr Klippel, with dry laborious pen, reveals the sufferings of the pursued, and the heroism with which they were met under the influence of Blücher and his voluntary chief of staff during the dreary three weeks that followed the first march rearward from their rallying-point at Nordhausen. It was no trifling feeling of friendship with which these two heroic souls met in common adversity at Hamburg, whither they were sent separately on parole. Tears came into the general's eyes as he pressed Scharnhorst's hand and cried: 'When you were taken, I was lost. You were the soul of my corps. Without you no one had any courage; without you there was nothing more to be done.' Nor were these hasty words, spoken in a mere impulse of good feeling; for Blücher wrote to the fugitive king with his own hand: 'I find it my special duty to recommend to your Majesty's particular favour the excellent, in this regard truly excellent, Colonel von Scharnhorst, to whose firm resolution and luminous counsel must be ascribed such success as my toilsome retreat had. For I willingly

‘ acknowledge that without this man’s active aid it would have been scarcely possible to do the half of that which the corps under my command actually did.’ As to Scharnhorst’s own feelings they are expressed with the simplicity natural to the man in the brief note addressed a few days later to his much-loved daughter, his confidential letters to whom were never interrupted by public cares or literary labour from the time she grew to womanhood. ‘ I am exchanged,’ he says ; ‘ thank God I am exchanged. General Blücher received me ‘ with tears in his eyes.’ Then, after repeating the general’s warm greeting, he adds, ‘ These flattering words reward me for ‘ all.’

It was as natural as right that Scharnhorst, who himself, as soon as released, bore Blücher’s despatches to Königsberg, should be welcomed warmly by the monarch, and by the brave queen at his side, who gave the last years of a life that was shortened by her country’s sorrows to the duty of keeping heart in her royal husband and his little court. All was done that could be to show him how his late services had endeared him to Prussia, and his request to proceed again as soon as might be into the field was answered by his immediate appointment as chief of staff to General Lestocq, who, with a small corps of six or seven thousand soldiers, representing all that Prussia had left, was moving to support Benningsen’s operations against Napoleon. The Russian general has never received full credit for the boldness with which, undismayed by his predecessor’s ill success in the autumn campaign in Poland, he advanced to encounter Napoleon, and contested with him the right to winter in East Prussia, in the bloody battle of Eylau. That Lestocq’s corps arrived in time to share in that desperate encounter, men and officers meeting with cheerfulness the severe test of a five days’ march through mud and snow, without regular rations, and under the constant discouragement of the desertion of Polish recruits, was due to Scharnhorst’s individual exertions ; for the general, though personally brave enough, was a worn-out veteran, quite unequal to the tremendous responsibility that had been suddenly laid on him, and he would have given up the attempt when almost in sight of his ally, but for the urging of his new staff-officer, who kept, however, from all but his king the secret his correspondence reveals. All histories of the tremendous conflict that followed admit the heroic valour with which the Prussian contingent entered into and maintained the fight—a valour at that time surprising to friend and foe, for the events of the year before made it wholly unexpected. This much was



recognised at once; but it was left to Prussian writers of our own generation to trace out the full share of the merit which belongs to Scharnhorst, and to show his 'sparing neither 'entreaty nor threat' (for thus Herr Klippel sums up the evidence as to what passed) to induce Benningsen to renew the conflict which had left the battle-field at dark divided between the combatants.

A little more of the daring that had risked so much already might have forced the French to yield their share next day; and the laurels won soon after at Aspern, when an Austrian arch-duke gave the hitherto invincible emperor his first check, would have been for ever the Russian chief's. But Benningsen's firmness after the action was not equal to the boldness with which he had sought it, nor to the fortune his star offered him. Bernadotte's corps, he knew, had not been engaged, and, less well-informed than we are to-day, he could not believe that the great strategist he opposed could have been so careless as to leave it out of reach. So he decided in spite of all remonstrance to withdraw, and left the barren honour of the ground to the French, who won it at the cost of a third of their army. The artist who, above all others, has entered into the spirit of Napoleon's victories, has a fit subject for his pencil in the mournful review of the shattered force that the emperor held next morning on the blood-stained field where 50,000 dead and wounded were stretched; and all who have studied the greatest battle-piece of the Louvre are aware that there is little sense of triumph depicted in the pale face that scans the long rows of sufferers who purchased for him the blood-bought field. Napoleon's unbroken prestige was saved, however, for the time. Königsberg, indeed, was left undisturbed by any fresh advance. Bertrand was even despatched to try and win Frederick William from his alliance with the Russians, with proposals the Prussian king had the sagacity to distrust, or the good faith to reject unhesitatingly. But the French siege of Dantzic was covered, and Napoleon's army effectively reinforced through the spring. And when Benningsen next faced him, the brief campaign of Friedland showed that the spell of genius and victory had not deserted their favourite. With one fierce blow the fine army of Russia, that had so long defied his efforts, was crushed and broken to a wreck, and the peace of Tilsit, the culminating triumph of Napoleon's life, was forced from her brave young emperor.

In this last short struggle the Prussian corps counted for as little as Prussian diplomacy in the hurried negotiation that closed it. Placed close to Königsberg, which he was charged

to defend, Lestocq became separated altogether from the Russians, and without influence on their campaign. With some of the natural suspiciousness of age, he had listened to those about him who whispered that it was derogatory to his rank to permit his chief of staff to take virtual command of his corps; and in his final retreat on the city he so openly repelled Scharnhorst's efforts to advise him, that the latter quitted a post in which his usefulness was gone, and hurried to Tilsit after his sovereign to await the result of the negotiations. The forebodings which he shared with others of the king's friends when the meeting of the emperors was announced as determined on, were soon fatally realised. Peace was signed on the terms the master of Europe dictated, and Prussia found herself at a stroke shorn of half her dominions, and reduced to the rank of a second-class power; whilst the territory nominally left her was so mortgaged to French demands that it seemed impossible to hope that even this would ever again be free from the hated grasp of her conqueror.

Then came the opportunity of her really great men. It is not within our task to tell how Stein, whose warnings Frederick William in better days had refused to listen to, was now placed at the head of the ruined State, and began its regeneration from within by the measures that struck off from the lower orders the last remnants of feudal bondage, and so breathed new life and vigour into the nation by awakening the dormant patriotism of the masses. When Stein was driven from the country he loved so dearly by Napoleon's instinctive jealousy, Hardenberg, a statesman of hardly meaner type, continued the good work he had begun. And ever side by side with Stein or Hardenberg, Scharnhorst was labouring incessantly in his own vocation at such a complete regeneration of the Prussian army as should make it meet to defend the liberties of a regenerate people. It would take tenfold the space at our disposal to recount how he worked out his problem point by point. First as head of a commission on military reorganisation, then in the newly-created ministry of war, finally in that post of Chief of the General Staff of which Europe, by a more recent example, has learnt the immense significance when in the hands of genius, he laboured unweariedly at the great work confided to his care by his royal master. All that was effete, useless, out of harmony with the age, vanished from the military service. Practical manœuvres in time of peace have been the distinctive mark of the Prussian army for half a century past; and it is the boast of her army that these exercises framed it into a machine ready for the field even after forty years of rest

from war. The whole system of such manœuvres, with all the principles that other nations are now eagerly adopting from Prussian practice, are to be found embodied in one of the multifarious papers written by Scharnhorst in the five years allowed him for the great business he undertook. Cavalry training was remodelled by his care with such a spirit that one might suppose he looked forward to the day when the activity of the Prussian horse should become a proverb through the world, and the very name of her Uhlan a terror to Prussia's foes. The artillery system, from being a cumbrous mixture of the 'bat-talion guns' of the age before Frederick, and the battery proper of his time, was brought to the simplicity and consistency of organisation which has raised the arm to be an essential part of all tactical combinations; and each young Prussian artilleryman from that time longed to outdo the achievements of swiftness and daring to which the French gunners had attained under the inspiration of a sovereign who, in his more genial moods, was not ashamed to recall publicly his own training as a lieutenant of their service. With the infantry Scharnhorst's reforms seem to have cost him less trouble than elsewhere; for it was hardly necessary to impress the necessity of adding skirmishing power to steadiness on those who had seen the stiffly drilled lines staggering and disordered by that rapid dropping fire from the bushes on the fatal heights above the Saar. And Scharnhorst's care extended to another arm not recognised before, as any part of a field army, but in which as a mere youth he had received his first commission from Count William. The various bodies of pontoon-carriers, sappers, and military artificers that had been so distributed before the war that, as he wrote of them confidentially, 'we never made any use of them, and when we did want them they were always out of the way,' were rolled into one compact force. To this corps, now fully uniformed as soldiers, a privilege hitherto denied, was given a new organisation, which distributed the various branches within each company in due proportion. This exists down to the present time as he framed it, and has made the Prussian field engineer service the model of practical efficiency which those of other countries are studying for their own profit. And, to crown his new creation with complete success, he sought a fitting chief, and found him, not in the ranks of those thus brought together, who had little experience either of men or of war, but in Colonel *Arneisenau*, the brave staff officer who, in the defence of Colberg against the French, had supplied by genius and courage the highest demands that any professional training could have met. Military engi-

neers are everywhere wont, as their arm comes into increasing prominence with the increase of science in war, to demand a larger share in those commands of mixed forces which are the soldier's most honourable ambition. Their claim is just; it is one indeed which the character of the age we are living in makes for them. But they should in fairness remember how Scharnhorst first raised their service from obscurity in Prussia by putting it under a man of genius whose training had been wider than that of those he commanded, and in seeking the charges that other soldiers seek, they should be prepared to yield to other soldiers, if judged fitted for them, a fair share of those technical posts which they are too ready to claim as their monopoly.

Each one of the achievements in organisation we have spoken of might have made the reputation of a war minister. But Scharnhorst's greatest effort has cast all these into the shade, and the originator of the short service; first known as the Krümper system from a weaver's technical phrase, will be remembered lastingly from its far-reaching results by those to whom his wide command of military science, and his exercise of it for Prussia's benefit in every branch of her forces, are things unheard of. His king was bound by treaty to Napoleon to maintain no more than 42,000 men under arms, all told. It was essential that this condition should be adhered to, whether the safety of the kingdom or the pledged word of the monarch were looked to. According to the system that had hitherto prevailed, this force could of course be augmented at the outbreak of war only as we in England have hitherto augmented ours, by the slow process of raising and training recruits, kept necessarily for months at dépôts away from the regiments ordered to the field. Scharnhorst, however, had steadily before him the vision of a sudden rupture with the French, when a large force would be needed, as it were, at a day's call. He pointed out to the king, and with long and steady persuasion won his assent to the notion, that extreme training and long repeated exercises, however sacred hitherto in Prussian eyes, must be laid aside for the greater object. The cadres of every battalion, squadron, and battery must be maintained full, effective, and highly disciplined; but the rank and file must be exchanged as often as was consistent with their acquiring their business, and after leaving the colours be registered so as to be available for future call. In such a manner only could the problem be solved that had exercised Count William's brain in Scharnhorst's boyhood of bringing a whole nation under arms to defend itself at a call, consistently with maintaining a very moderate

force in time of peace. The lessons sown by the Steinhuder Lake thirty years before now blossomed into abundant harvest in the fruitful brain that had received them ; and 270,000 trained soldiers answering the roll-call as soon as the day came to strike for freedom, attested the practical value which sound military theory well worked out has on human affairs.

It must not be supposed that Scharnhorst was allowed to remodel all existing military institutions at his will, and thus recast the future destiny of the great monarchy that owes so much to arms, without finding many difficulties to encounter. The vested interests of some, the timidity of others, the courtier's grudge of his influence with the king, all had to be encountered in their turn. But none of them were so hard to overcome as the doubts that arose in Frederick William's own mind as to the wisdom of these sweeping changes. There were certain seasons, indeed, when the sovereign himself showed some forgetfulness of a pledge he had voluntarily given shortly after his great misfortunes. For Scharnhorst's reputation had travelled during the events of 1806-7 far beyond the limits of Prussia, and his own born sovereign grudged her the soldier and teacher she had gained. Before the peace of Tilsit was signed there had come, under the hand of the then Duke of Cambridge, the best known to the Hanoverians of our princes, a munificent offer from King George. His newly received rank of major-general was assured Scharnhorst if he would transfer his services to England, and with it large powers for conducting such instruction there as he had long carried on in Hanover. He had refused this on Frederick William's promise to give him his full and complete confidence in his projects for reforming the service of his adoption. Yet the king was sometimes touched with a natural jealousy of the new office which he had raised up between his own royal presence and the army which he had been wont to administer personally in every detail. 'Here is this project round my neck still,' he would say at such a time, 'though I have told you a hundred times I will not have it.' But Scharnhorst, unmoved, only withdrew his scheme to put it forward again on some more happy occasion. Mindful of Hardenberg's advice, 'Never appear to want to govern him,' he could wait patiently until his reasoning was heard out, and his thorough devotion to his adopted sovereign and country recognised by the acceptance of his plan. Occasionally, indeed, he desponded, and the unceasing letters in which he revealed his whole life to his loved daughter show traces here and there of a passing feeling that his task would never be carried through. It was interrupted too more

than once by illness; as when prostrated by fever caught on one of the rapid and secret journeys to St. Petersburg which the king's confidants made every now and then to keep up for him the friendship with Russia, which French Imperialism thought a crime. But Scharnhorst was not one of those whose secrets perish with them, and whose work depends upon their constant presence. He had already carefully built up a school of successors, Gneisenau, Grolmann, Prince Augustus (the new chief of the artillery), and Clausewitz being prominent among them, who were capable of continuing the work he had traced out for them with unmistakable clearness. The last finishing touch was his creation of a Landwehr. It was formed by enrolling volunteers who had escaped through age or other excuse the training he gave the mass of Prussia's youth, and was to be equipped chiefly by local means if called out. This Landwehr represented rather, in fact, the Landsturm of later days than the thoroughly drilled force Prussia now maintains under the former name; for this there was no means of providing under the French treaty, which forbade any addition to the army in the form of regular militia. Yet it is plain that the now familiar principle of a large domestic reserve of adults ready to assist in their country's need was bequeathed by the founder of this new institution. With this new creation his task was accomplished. All had been done for Prussia that genius could devise in utilising the strength and means of the diminished monarchy for the shock.

The hour came, and all was found ready. We cannot follow here the steps by which the crisis was brought about. In 1811 Napoleon's power over middle Europe reached its zenith, and Frederick William had to submit to the fresh degradation of a forced alliance with France against the Russian emperor, an act of humiliation death spared his brave queen from witnessing. Scharnhorst would have had him refuse the terms put before him at any cost, and even retire, if necessary, into private life, rather than turn his arms against the true friend of his monarchy. But the king took a different view of his duty. To abandon his post thus, all humiliating as it was to keep it, he argued to be a desertion of sacred trust; and rather than break openly with the dictator, whose forces held Prussia in their grasp, he signed the treaty which bound him to furnish a contingent of half his small army. In doing this no doubt he trusted something to the chapter of events; but the most sanguine adversaries of French policy hardly hoped for the speedy collapse of what seemed an invincible power,

until the Niemen had been crossed and the difficulties of the new adventure made manifest.

Scharnhorst had retired for a while from active duty. His fine soul loathed any share in the degrading task laid on the Prussian army, and so he passed on leave of absence into Austria to study her battle-fields in detail, and draw fresh materials for the great Work on War which was the one scheme of his life he left unaccomplished. The work was never written by him; but Clausewitz, on whom his literary mantle fitly fell, has told us, with all the modesty of a great writer speaking of his master: 'Though Scharnhorst left most of the materials, it cannot but be difficult to put them together without the builder's hand. For his thought was so original, he looked at things so differently from other men, that one might well fear, even if the whole materials were forthcoming, to be found wanting in the soul of all, the ideas that were to build them up.'

From meditating on this design, from putting finishing touches to his completed works, and from ceaselessly pouring out all the feelings of a fond parent's heart in letters to his daughter, now happily married to Count Dohna one of his former pupils, Scharnhorst was roused by the news that came in fitfully and uncertainly over the Russian border of the hasty retreat of the great host which had been heard of before as holding Moscow triumphantly and forcing Russia to terms. On December 27th, 1812, we find him writing to the countess from Silesia in cautious terms: 'They are telling here marvellous stories of the armies in Russia.' Then comes a break of some weeks in that unwearied correspondence, until the writer appears again at Breslau with his sovereign, deeply engaged in state and military affairs. His letters are prudently worded, for the mail-bags were still open to French inspection; but between the fond inquiries for his newly-born grandson and messages as to the affairs of his estate come the significant words, 'All the Royal family has arrived; the place is swarming with soldiers.' For in the interval York and the Prussian contingent of Napoleon's army had made a private capitulation. Stein, brought in ostensibly by Russian arms, had taken possession of East Prussia under Alexander's authority, and was arming it against the French; and the only question remaining to be settled was what terms should be offered to Napoleon by the king, whose support of him in Germany any longer would give Russia just cause for hostile occupation of the monarchy her victorious army was entering as a deliverer. Events now hurried on from day to day, and when once it was ascertained that Austria designed neutrality,

Scharnhorst was despatched forthwith on his king's behalf to meet the Emperor Alexander; and the famous treaty of Kalisch was signed which gave new life to Europe, for it framed the new coalition against Napoleon under the weight of which he was to fall. Prussia pledged herself to bring 80,000 men at once into the field, exclusive of all garrisons and depôts—a warlike effort which, it has been truly said, could only have been made because the warm devotion of her people could be made instantly available by the wise measures which Scharnhorst had prepared in time of peace.

A few weeks later a mighty army of the allied troops was entering Saxony, its Prussians under Blücher; and at Blücher's side rode his old chief of staff, whose strategy for the new campaign was the plan accepted for it by the allied sovereigns. To advance boldly to the Elbe, to strike in on Napoleon's flank as he crossed the historic plain beyond it with the levies he was hurrying from the Rhine, to take an offensive part in fact from the very first against the great master of offensive war: such was the simple and sufficient design. On May 2nd, within sight of the great stone that marks the spot where the 'Lion of the North' gave his life in the cause of northern Protestantism, the armies closed desperately, and the new battle of Lutzen surpassed in fierceness even the crowning contest of the great religious war two centuries before. Struck down in this first encounter, as he led on the young troops sword in hand; dying afterwards of a wound thought so little dangerous that he had rashly undertaken, before it was healed, a long journey to Vienna in hope to win Austria to the cause of European freedom; Scharnhorst was taken away too soon to reap the smallest fruit of his long toil. Yet he had not singled out and trained and infused his own spirit into other men in vain. Gneisenau guided the army of Blücher from victory to victory, until it shared in the finishing triumph of Waterloo. Clausewitz lived to write the great work on War, the teachings of which were to make Prussia the foremost military power of the world. And though long guided and taught by others, she does not forget the strategist and writer to whom the first inspiration was due, the hero who showed her that in humiliation may be found the path to new honours. Nor should Scharnhorst's name be unknown in our own land. For under a British general were won his first honours. From our own monarch came his first rewards. Under England's banner he first illustrated the truth he taught in action as in word, that the highest studies of the closet are not incompatible with the most splendid merit in the field.



ART. II.—*The Book of Carloverock: Memoirs of the Maxwells, Earls of Nithsdale, Lords Maxwell and Herries.* By WILLIAM FRASER. Vol. I. Memoirs. Vol. II. Correspondence and Charters. Quarto. Edinburgh: 1873.

FEW cavalcades ever presented a gayer appearance than that which issued from the gates of 'Merrie Carlisle' in the summer of the year of grace 1300. In command was no less a person than the 'Malleus Scottorum,' Edward I., King of England and Scotland, Lord of Ireland, Prince of Wales and Duke of Aquitaine, and with him his eldest son, the future king. In attendance upon their liege lord were eighty-nine of the noblest barons and knights of the realm, and their retainers 3,000 strong. 'They set forth,' says an eyewitness, 'not in coats and surcoats, but on powerful and costly chargers; and that they might not be taken by surprise, they were well and securely armed. There were many rich caparisons embroidered on silks and satins; many a beautiful pennon fixed to a lance; and many a banner displayed. And afar off was the noise heard of the neighing of horses: hills and valleys were everywhere covered with sumpter horses and waggons, with provisions and sacks of tents and pavilions. And the days were long and fine. They proceeded by easy journeys, arranged in four squadrons.\*

At the head of the first division rode the good Earl of Lincoln, 'burning with valour,' and with him Robert de Fitz Walter, 'who well knew the use of arms, and so used them when required;' the Earl of Hereford, 'a rich and elegant young man,' and Nicholas de Segrave, 'whom nature had adorned in body and enriched in heart.' Next came the Earl of Warren, one 'that well knew how to lead noble and honourable men.' The third squadron was commanded by the King. 'In his banner were three leopards courant,' says our authority, who revels in the heraldic details, 'of fine gold, set on red, fierce, haughty, and cruel; thus placed to signify that like them the King is dreadful, fierce, and proud to his enemies, for his bite is slight to none who inflame his anger; not but his kindness is soon rekindled towards such as seek his friendship or submit to his power.' With him was John of Brittany, well deserving the preference of being nearest,

---

\* The Siege of Carloverock, translated by Sir Harris Nicolas. London: 1828. 8vo.

‘ having assiduously served his uncle from his infancy, and left his father and other relations to dwell in his household, when the King had occasion for his followers ; ’ also ‘ Robert, the Lord of Clifford, to whom reason gives consolation, who always remembers to overcome his enemies. He may call Scotland to bear witness of his noble lineage, that originated well and nobly, as he is of the race of the noble Marshal who at Constantinople fought with an unicorn and struck him dead beneath him. If I were a young maiden,’ continues the enraptured chronicler, ‘ I would give him my heart and person, so great is his fame.’ Last of all came the King’s son, a youth of seventeen, and bearing arms for the first time. ‘ He was a well-proportioned and handsome person, of a courteous disposition and intelligent; and desirous of finding an occasion to display his prowess. He managed his steed wonderfully well, and bore with a blue label the arms of the good King his father.’ An auxiliary force was commanded by Anthony Beck, Bishop of Durham, ‘ ever at hand when there was fighting—the most vigilant clerk in the kingdom—a true mirror of Christianity.’

But why all this parade? How strange in our modern ears sounds the answer, that the mission of these heroes of a new Iliad was nothing more than the siege of a border castle in the sister kingdom of Scotland.

Carlawerock Castle, in Dumfriesshire, was in former days a place of no little importance, being in fact the key to the south-west of Scotland, and consequently giving its possessors very considerable influence in that portion of the kingdom. The original castle is said to have been erected in the sixth century, on a site where the walls were then washed by the waters of the Solway Frith. The newer building occupied a very strong position, the Frith guarding the approach in one direction, and the great Lochar Moss, with its vast expanse of wild and irreclaimable moorland, in another. During the Scottish wars of Edward I., the castle continued to hold out after those of Edinburgh, Elgin, Dunbar, and others had been reduced to submission. Every machine known in those rude days of military engineering seems to have been brought into requisition at the siege. We are told of battering-rams, robinets, springalds, a sow (something like the Roman *testudo*), a multo, which the ‘ *Liber Quotidianus Garderobæ* ’ is kind enough to explain to be an engine for throwing stones, and a berfrarium, which it does not explain. After a gallant defence of two whole days the besieged were obliged to capitulate, when it was found to the king’s great astonishment that the

garrison amounted to no more than sixty men. The metrical chronicler assures us that the king commanded that life and limb should be spared them, and that each should receive a new garment. The 'Chronicle of Lanercost' gives a somewhat different version: 'Many that were found within the castle were hanged.'

After the siege the castle continued more or less securely in the possession of the English till the year 1355, when Roger Kirkpatrick, of Closeburn, wrested it out of their hands. Not long afterwards it was the scene of a fearful tragedy. His father had aided Bruce in murdering the Red Comyn in the Dominican church at Dumfries. Sir James of Lyndsay, a descendant from another sharer in the murder, was being entertained in the castle, when, in revenge for Kirkpatrick's having married a beautiful lady of whom he himself had been enamoured, he stole to his host's bedside and stabbed him in his sleep. The night was dark; he lost his way, and galloped fruitlessly till morning, when he was captured at no great distance from the castle. He was brought to trial, and, notwithstanding the exertions of his wife, Egidia Stewart, a niece of the king, he was executed in June 1357.

Lyndsay's body is said to have been buried in the castle rampart, precisely at a place where some few years ago the skeleton of a tall and powerfully-built man was found, and it seems highly probable that the remains were those of Sir James. For, though the castle then in existence was 'levelled to the ground,' there are reasons for supposing that the new buildings, erected by Sir Robert Maxwell, of Maxwell and Carlaverock, in 1370-1407, were placed upon the old site, and that the castle was not so entirely demolished but that some portions, still existing, were found available for the new fortress. A more serious demolition overtook it in 1570, when the Earl of Sussex was sent against it, in revenge for the part the then owner had taken in behalf of Mary Queen of Scots; but its final destruction was not accomplished till 1640—two years only after it had been repaired and fortified by the first Earl of Nithsdale.

In that year it was besieged by the Covenanters, and held out gallantly for thirteen weeks. King Charles had encouraged the earl by promises of assistance, but at last was compelled to advise him to deliver up the place on the best conditions he could yet. Lieutenant-colonel Home took possession, whilst the earl, his friends, followers, and soldiers, each with his arms and shot, with all their bag and baggage, trunks, household stuff belonging on their honour and credit

to his Lordship and them, were to have safe conduct to Langholm or any other place within Nithsdale.

No sooner, however, were the earl's party safely out of the way than the conquerors forgot their promises, and seized the furniture. A list of the things 'intromitted with' by the Covenanting colonel has been preserved, and is printed by Mr. Fraser. It affords, as he says, an illustration of the magnificent hospitality of the baronial house of Nithsdale in the seventeenth century. Among other articles mentioned are no less than eighty-five beds; 'of these beds were five, two of silk and three of cloth, consisting each of five coverings, with massy silk fringes of half-a-quarter deep, and a counterpane of the same stuff, all laid with braid silk lace, and a small fringe about, with feather-bed, bolster, blankets, &c., every bed estimated at 110*l.* sterling.' The earl's library was also carried off, which had cost him 200*l.* This may seem at first sight a small sum for a nobleman's library, but it would represent something like 1,000*l.* now. 'The drawing-room was hung with cloth of silver, and the chairs and stools in it were covered with red velvet, with fringes of crimson silk and gilt nails. Besides the comfortable beds, the occupants of the castle had in the wine cellars four barrels of sack and three hogshheads of French wines.' (Vol. i. p. 61.)

The castle was soon afterwards demolished by order of the Committee of Estates, and was never occupied again as a place of residence; but its crumbling walls, its massive towers, and its triple portcullis still succeed in rendering it one of the finest specimens of the old baronial residences of Scotland.\* Close by it is the hill of Wardlaw, or Barrow Hill, covered with the remains of ancient camps, British and Roman. It was a convenient place of rendezvous for the clan, and from it they got their slogan or war-cry of 'A Wardlaw.'

But it is time to inquire about the possessors of this lordly castle. In later periods of Scottish history they are known as Maxwells. Their origin is traced to a certain Maccus, son of the Undwin, who had to fly in consequence of the invasion of William the Norman, and who sought refuge, as Edgar Atheling did, in Scotland. He must have been very young at the time, or have lived to a very advanced age, as the time of his death is put about 1150. We are quite at liberty to suppose

---

\* It was, we believe, the castle of Carlarverock that Sir Walter Scott had in his mind in the description of the majestic ruin of a similar abode in 'Guy Rannering,' and the scene of that admirable novel, on the wild coast of Galloway, is not very remote from Carlarverock itself.

that he may have been connected with Maccus, son of Anlaf, the expelled king of Northumbria, who slew with his own hand the usurping Eric, King Harold's son, together with his son and brother, on the wilds of Stanmore. Again, he may have been kinsman to Maccus of Mar and the Hebrides, who was one of the eight petty kings that formed Edgar's crew on the river Dee, and who unblushingly signs himself 'Archipirata' when witnessing a charter still in existence. At any rate, 'looking at the important position the second Maccus took at 'once in Scotland, and at the identity of the names,' Mr. Fraser thinks it possible that 'he may have been a descendant 'of the royal archpirate.' With the same amount of probability he may have been connected with Maxtoke in Warwickshire, one of the Saxon manors which the Norman invader so charitably bestowed on his favourites. 'Maxtoke is said to 'have been the property of Almundus, or Ailwynd, which without any straining may be regarded as identical with Undeweyn. 'This would lead to the inference that some of Undwyn's ancestors had borne the name of Maccus from which the designation of their property was taken.' (Vol. i. p. 2.)

However this may be, there is no doubt that Maccus was an important personage, if not in the time of Malcolm Canmore himself, yet certainly in that of his sons, Alexander I. and David I., holding probably, as his son and grandson did, the office of Sheriff of Roxburghshire or Teviotdale. From the last-mentioned sovereign he obtained the manor of Maccuswell, or Maxwell, originally, no doubt, a part of the royal domains. Here he built his castle, of which however the very site is now unknown. It continued to be the property of the Maxwells till 1601, when the manor was sold in two portions, one of which is at present possessed by the Duke of Roxburgh, the other by Sir G. H. S. Douglas, Bart., who changed the name of Maxwell, or rather Bridgend, as it had come to be called, to Springwood Park. The castle was soon abandoned as a residence in favour of Carlaverock, which, as we have seen, was certainly in the possession of the family before 1300, and is said indeed to have been acquired by a grandson of the founder.

Authorities are by no means agreed as to the derivation of the name of Maxwell. Chalmers, Riddell, Innes, &c., pronounce for its being a shortened form of Maccusville, answering to Somerville, Umfraville, Frecheville, and other names of similar termination. None of the older charters, however, furnish an instance of this spelling, and Mr. Fraser ventures on a new etymology. Before acquiring the new

domain Maccus seems to have lived at Maccuston, or Maxton. On his change of residence the natural name for his new castle was already appropriated, and to make a distinction between it and the old castle some feature of the surrounding country would be sought.

‘Near Maxwellheugh there is a salmon-cast, well known to anglers as Maxwheel (wele, well, or weil being the Saxon for an eddy), the well of Maccus. This eddy wheeled in Tweed before that river had a name, and the character of the rock which produces it must have made it a noted spot before Saxon set foot on Scottish ground. Maccus having fixed his residence on the heights above this eddy, what more natural than that it should be called the wele of Maccus; that his descendants should be spoken of as those who came from the neighbourhood of Maccuswele—*de Maccus wele*. If they were once so designated, the name would soon assume the form of Maxwell.’ (Vol. i. pp. 16, 17.)

The earliest use of the name appears to be that in a charter, of 1159, by Herbert, the eldest son of Maccus, a generous friend of the Church, wherein he describes himself as Herbert de Macuswel. Remembering the unconstrained license in spelling which those who could write at all then indulged in, we are not surprised to find the two other forms Maccuswel and Maccuswell, which Mr. Fraser gives, or even the yet other nine varieties which appear in the ‘*Origines parochiales Scotiæ*’ (vol. i. pp. 297, 445).

The son of this Herbert was in no little favour with the kings in whose reigns he lived, and was often employed by them in matters of state. By Alexander II. he was twice sent with other ambassadors to England, once in 1215, on business not definitely specified, and again on a more important mission in 1220, when he was one of the persons entrusted to negotiate a marriage between his sovereign and the Princess Joanna of England, sister of Henry III. Soon after this Maxwell appears as a knight, a distinction probably conferred as a reward for the success of these negotiations; and he is found in constant attendance upon the king who, in 1230, appointed him Lord Chamberlain, an office which, for whatever reasons, he soon resigned.

In Sir John’s brother and successor, Aymer, we find the first example of the modern spelling, Maxwell. During the minority of Alexander III. he joined himself to the Comyns, or ‘national’ party, with varying fortunes, until 1251, when during the festivities at York in honour of the marriage of the king—then ten years old—with Margaret, daughter of Henry III., Alan Durward, the Lord Justiciary of Scotland and leader of the opposite faction, was detected in an attempt to

secure, through the influence of the pope, the succession of the kingdom, if the king should die without issue, in favour of his own children by the king's natural sister whom he had married. Aymer was one of the new guardians appointed by the English king, who had designs of his own about Scotland, and continued to be so till 1255, when Durward, who had ingratiated himself with Henry, succeeded in getting the Earl of Gloucester and others sent from England, who were to take means to remove Maxwell and his associates from their office. Queen Margaret had found Scotland a far from comfortable home, and jealousy towards England was suggested as the cause of the treatment she was reported to be receiving. A meeting between the two opposing factions at Edinburgh seemed likely to bring about a satisfactory understanding, when the Durward party, on the advice of the English ambassadors, suddenly entered the castle and made the king and queen prisoners, carrying them off to Roxburgh Castle, where King Henry met them. An Act passed soon afterwards ordered the exclusion of the former guardians from their office, King Alexander declaring that it was specially granted at the instance of his dearest father Henry, who 'for our honour and advantage and for the honour and advantage of our kingdom, had by his favour personally come to the borders of the kingdoms of England and Scotland.'

But retribution soon came. The new Bishop of St. Andrews was outlawed by the new guardians and the revenues of his bishopric seized. The case was brought before the pope, who made short work of the bishop's enemies by excommunicating them 'with bell, book, and candle' in every church and chapel in the kingdom, and finally by name as contumacious offenders in the abbey church of Cambuskenneth.

The fear of a possible interdict put great power into the hands of Maxwell and his friends, which was increased by the influence of Mary de Couci, widow of Alexander II., who with John de Brienne, her second husband, passed at that time through England to Scotland. They ventured accordingly in 1257 to enter the king's room at Kinross by night, seized his person as he lay in bed, got possession of the great seal, a moveable of novel introduction,\* and went off with their prize to Stirling. Durward fled to England, and his party was broken up. Aymer Maxwell now became Lord Chamberlain, and afterwards Justiciar of Galloway and Sheriff of Dumfriesshire. He is said to have fallen at the battle of Largs in

1263, but he was certainly alive in the following year, and 1266 is a more probable date for his decease.

Through his wife, Mary Makgaghan, he acquired the lands and barony of Mearns in Renfrewshire, which continued in possession of the family of Maxwell for 400 years. From one of his sons, John, is descended the Pollok branch of the family, now represented by Sir W. Stirling Maxwell, Bart., of Pollok.

The fifth Lord Maxwell's lot was cast in troublous times. King Alexander III. was killed by an accident in 1285, and his only descendant then living, the 'Maiden of Norway,' died on her way to Scotland in 1290, at the early age of eight. Twelve competitors appeared for the vacant throne; but they were soon reduced to two, Bruce and Baliol, both descended from a brother of William the Lion; the first a son of the younger, the other a grandson of the elder daughter. The King of England was asked to act as umpire, and he very cleverly seized the opportunity of being acknowledged as Lord Superior of the Kingdom of Scotland—a title that had been extorted at the time of the captivity of William the Lion, but generously renounced by Richard I. Maxwell supported Baliol's claims, which were also pronounced valid by the King of England.

Edward's pretensions to be Lord Paramount soon led to serious complications. Baliol's gratitude at first induced him to make concessions, which he afterwards regretted. But when Edward, on making war against France, called on the Scots as his vassals to join him, Baliol, so far from complying, entered into a treaty offensive and defensive with France, and for a marriage between his own eldest son, the heir apparent, and a niece of the French king. Edward was not long in taking vengeance. The fatal field of Dunbar, in which Bruce fought on the side of the English, laid the country at his mercy, and Baliol had nothing to do but submit, and to be taken from one place of captivity to another till he arrived at the Tower of London. About the same time 'Sir Herbert de 'Makeswell, Knight,' amongst others, did homage to Edward at Berwick-on-Tweed.

Soon afterwards a new champion of Scotland arose in the person of Wallace, of Ellerslie. Several strongholds in Nithsdale fell into his power, and a party of English were routed at Dalswinton Wood. One night the hero found entertainment and welcome at Carluverock, and soon after this the famous siege of the castle took place (but strange to say whether Sir Herbert Maxwell, or his son John, or his grandson Eustace,



was then in possession, seems quite uncertain), to be followed by the brutal death of Wallace himself in 1305.

The following year saw Robert Bruce (grandson of the former claimant), who had repented of the active part he had hitherto taken against his country, crowned King of Scotland; but Sir Eustace Maxwell, the then head of the family, is found in 1312 on the side of Edward II., who, in order that his friend might more effectually keep Carlaverock, remitted him the yearly payment of 22*l.* due to the Exchequer at Berwick. But Maxwell soon changed his mind and joined Bruce, which led to a second siege of the castle. This time however, though operations were carried on for several weeks, they were so feebly conducted that the attempt was abandoned. It does not appear that Sir Eustace, or any of the Maxwells, can boast of having been at Bannockburn.

We next find Sir Eustace taking part in the famous letter to Pope John XXII., who, under Edward's influence, had excommunicated Robert Bruce and all his party, and laid Scotland under an interdict. One hundred and thirteen kings, so ran the letter, had reigned over them, and no foreigner had interfered till Edward of England came, and by his tyranny caused grievous sufferings. Robert the Bruce had happily delivered them—to him they were bound to adhere. The pope ought to tell the King of England to mind his own business and not meddle with his neighbours. And it concluded thus: 'If your Holiness, too credulous of the misrepresentations of the English, do not give fair credence to what we have said, nor cease to favour them to our confusion, all the destruction of life, ruin of souls, and other calamities which they shall inflict on us and we on them, will, we believe, be laid to your charge by the Most High.' This outspoken epistle, of which one of the original copies was found in the Earl of Haddington's charter room at Tynninghame, and is now in the Register House, Edinburgh, has been photographed for that very valuable and interesting work '*The National Manuscripts of Scotland.*' We have no hesitation about agreeing with the learned editor when he says that 'It is surely the noblest burst of patriotic feeling, the finest declaration of independence that real history has to show and that has been preserved in the language in which it was uttered. We can forgive the Scotch schoolmaster who used this letter as an exercise for his boys in Latin, holding that its patriotism covered any defects of Latinity.'\*

---

\* Pt. ii. p. viii. See Photog. No. xxv.

It deserved better success than it actually obtained. The pope, indeed, staggered by its plain language, made some attempt at getting Bruce and Edward reconciled; but they could never agree upon the conditions.

We next find Sir Eustace in no little danger of his life. With ten other persons he was accused of a plot against Bruce, which had for its object the conferring the crown upon the High Steward, Sir William de Soulis; who indeed, but for the illegitimacy of his grandmother, a natural daughter of Alexander II., had better claims than either Bruce or Baliol. But whilst Soulis himself was sentenced by the 'Black Parliament' to perpetual imprisonment, and David Brechin, the king's nephew, who had distinguished himself in Palestine, was with others barbarously put to death, Sir Eustace was fortunate enough to be set at liberty.

Until the death of the king in 1329, Sir Eustace continued faithful; but soon afterwards he transferred his allegiance to Baliol's eldest son, who took advantage of the youth of the new king—only four years old—to try to get possession of the throne, and was supported by Edward III. Maxwell took part in the siege of Perth, and in the coronation of Baliol at Scone. After the battle of Halidon Hill, which, by English assistance, made Baliol master of nearly the whole kingdom, he was one of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the revenues of the town of Berwick-on-Tweed, which at that time surrendered to the English; but so negligently did he discharge his duties that he brought upon himself a severe reprimand from the king.

About 1337, Sir Eustace changed his mind again, and sided with the Scottish party which was adverse to Baliol, who had taken advantage of Edward's absence in France to attempt to expel the English from the kingdom. It was somewhat ungrateful, to say the least of it, to choose that special time for transferring his allegiance, as his castle had just been put into good order by money out of the English Exchequer. But his newly-revived patriotism was of short duration, and in 1339 we find him once more making submission and obtaining pardon from the English king. In 1342 his fickle career terminated, and he was succeeded in his estates by his brother John.

Sir John Maxwell plays no prominent part in public matters. Baliol meanwhile had been obliged to retire from the kingdom, and David Bruce had returned from France in 1341. Maxwell was one of those who accompanied the king in that invasion of England which terminated so disastrously at Neville's Cross in 1346. At this battle, with the king and many others, he was

taken prisoner and conveyed to the Tower. Baliol seized the opportunity of making war on his own account, and obtained possession of Carlaverock, where he took up his residence for some time.

We may pass over some of Sir John's successors, of whom we know little or nothing of importance, merely mentioning in passing a member of the Pollok branch of the Maxwells who distinguished himself at Chevy Chase. Here he—not 'Lord Maxwell,' as is sometimes asserted—captured Sir Ralph Percy, brother of Hotspur. Hotspur himself was taken prisoner by a relation of Maxwell's, Sir Hugh Montgomery.

Herbert Maxwell inherited the family estates in 1420. Four years afterwards, King James had been released after eighteen years' captivity in England, through the exertions of Murdock, Duke of Albany, his cousin, and was crowned at Scone. Herbert of Maxwell received on that occasion the honour of knighthood. His spurs had not had time to rust before he found himself involved in the charges made against Murdock, who was taken prisoner and sent to Carlaverock. The tower in which the duke was confined is still called 'Murdock's tower;' from hence he was carried to his place of execution at Stirling. What the duke had done to be thus summarily disposed of is not quite clear. His father indeed, a crafty, ambitious, and cruel man, had no doubt had designs on the throne, and for that end had starved King Robert's eldest son, the Duke of Rothesay, to death, and would have been glad enough to get rid of James, the only remaining brother also, had he not been sent off to France and fallen, on his way there, into the hands of the English instead. Anyhow, the duke himself, his two sons, and his father-in-law were all put to death. Perhaps the king's anger was satisfied; perhaps the charge against Herbert of Maxwell rested on frail evidence; at any rate he was soon taken into favour again, on promise of good behaviour for the future.

He was the first of the house of Maxwell on whom the dignity of the peerage was conferred, having been created a 'Lord of Parliament'—a new order of peers, introduced by James from England, where it was already in existence. The occasion on which it was conferred has not been recorded, but it was certainly before 1445. He was also the first of the family who held the office of 'Warden of the Marches,' an office of which we shall hear a good deal presently; and which had been instituted by Robert Bruce, who committed the care of a large portion of the borders to the 'good Lord James of Douglas,' an appointment which contributed materially to the greatness

of that noble house. In 1448 he was at the battle of Sark, where the Douglas and Percy met again, and in which the English were totally defeated; in great measure owing, as a genealogical account of the Maxwells assures us, to Lord Maxwell, who 'wan the field.' Hollingshed says, that he and the Laird of Johnston commanded the left wing.

About this time the power of the 'Black Douglasses' had reached its height, and soon afterwards in 1452, it received its first great check through the king murdering with his own hand the then head of the family, whilst on a visit to him at Stirling. To save himself from well-merited chastisement, the king had to look round for help, and he found no more valuable assistance than that of the Earl of Angus—the chief of the 'Red Douglasses'—the younger branch of that famous house. At one time it is said the king thought of flight and abdication, but brighter days came, and in 1455, when the Earl of Douglas saw, to his bitter disappointment, the formidable army he had collected melting like snow, the Douglas influence was dispersed and destroyed.

If the Maxwells had any hand in the forcible abduction of the young king, James III., from Linlithgow, in 1466—and from their intimate relations with the Boyds it is by no means unlikely—the second lord was certainly not involved in the well-merited fate which three years later overtook the perpetrators of that outrage. During the many rebellions of the Douglasses he remained faithful to his sovereign, and died quietly at home—not as the 'Genealogical Account' declares, on the field of Bannockburn.

His eldest son had before that, in 1484, met with a violent death. The Duke of Albany, the king's brother, who had incurred the king's suspicion through the evil persuasion of Robert Cochrane 'the mason,' and Lord Douglas, who had been for twenty years a banished man in England, made a sudden descent upon Lochmaben, in Annandale, with 500 horse, at the time of the annual fair held in that place. A fierce conflict ensued, in which the rebels were at last routed. 'The Master of Maxwell was severely wounded in the battle, and at the close, when leaning on his sword, he was mortally stabbed by a person of the name of Gask, a Scotclman, who, in revenge for the death of his cousin whom the Master of Maxwell in the administration of justice had doomed to be hanged, came behind and inflicted the fatal stroke. Lord Maxwell died on the spot.' (Vol. i. p. 154.) A column still standing marks the place. The Duke of Albany escaped, but the earl—the last of the Black Douglasses, advanced in years

and encumbered with his armour, was made prisoner and carried to the Abbey of Lindores, where, after four years of confinement, he died.

The fourth Lord Maxwell—to follow Mr. Fraser's numeration—was a man of ability and naturally took part in the public affairs of his time. From his being a member of the first parliament of James IV. and the honours conferred upon him by the new king, it would seem that he had departed from the loyalty on which the family have always, and with reason, prided themselves, and had had a share in the conspiracy against James III., which ended in the defeat of that king at Sauchie Burn, and his death by an unknown hand at Beaton's Mill, in 1488. He died at last on the field of battle. When Henry VIII. had declared war against France, Louis XII. induced the Scots to invade England. So beloved was the king by his subjects, that he soon collected a considerable army. But he miscalculated his strength, and with thirteen earls, two bishops, two mitred abbots, Lord Maxwell and his three brothers, and many a noble gentleman besides, fell on the fatal field of Flodden, in 1513.

The fifth Lord Maxwell is a still more historical personage. 'This lord,' says Mr. Fraser, 'occupies a distinguished position as a statesman, as Warden of the Marches, as a general, and as an admiral. For many years he enjoyed the favour of his sovereign, and was one of the counsellors upon whose advice he relied; one of the courtiers in whose society he had most pleasure. When James V. deserted tried servants for a less worthy favourite, he involved himself in ruin, his country in disaster, and Lord Maxwell in trouble for the remainder of his life.' (Vol. i. p. 173.) Mr. Fraser, we venture to think, has dealt very tenderly with the somewhat dubious character, to say the least of it, of this gentleman. Perhaps it is because the late Mr. M. C. Maxwell, of Terregles, to whom we are largely indebted for the existence of the two noble volumes before us, had expressed his belief not only that the Maxwells were second to none in Scotland for their loyalty, which is quite true, but that 'no head of the Maxwell family even at any period gave up his religion.' (Pref. p. xviii.) He must have forgotten for the moment the Lord Maxwell we are now discussing, or perhaps he was in no way anxious to recognise so slippery a character as a relation, and quite ready to wish the Protestants, if they cared to claim him, joy of their bargain.

At the time of the disaster of Flodden he was on his way with a fleet to France, but was driven back by a tempest. On hearing of the deaths of the king and his own father, he pre-

pared for possible emergencies by seizing the castles of Thrieve and Lochmaben. Soon afterwards he was appointed by the Duke of Albany, the son of the banished duke of whom we have heard already, to the important office of Warden of the West Marches which, with other offices afterwards conferred on him and his extensive landed possessions, made his influence paramount in the south-west of Scotland. Lord Dacre, the Warden of the English Marches, at first highly approved of the appointment, but changed his mind on finding that his colleague was ready enough to make promises but very slow at keeping them. Indeed, he seems to have been quite as ready to exact black mail on his own account as to repress such evil practices in others. Meanwhile an opportunity of further advancement presented itself. The Regent Albany, after various difficulties, had been obliged finally to retire to France in 1524, and the Queen Dowager, aided by Lord Maxwell, and the Earl of Arran, the head of the Hamiltons, managed that James V., though then only ten years old, should be declared to have taken the reins of government into his own hands. The care of the king's person was entrusted to a guard of 200 men, and Lord Maxwell was appointed captain to the great delight of the Dowager. Meanwhile the 'Red Douglasses' were increasing in power and influence, and their tyranny at last became so intolerable that James in 1528 managed to escape to Stirling, and all communication with Angus, who hitherto had managed matters as he liked, was strictly forbidden. When, after a few days, the king ventured to return to Edinburgh, such was the fear into which the court was thrown at the time, that a guard was kept all night, on one occasion the king himself taking command in full armour. An attempt was made by Maxwell to get Angus into his power; but though it was unsuccessful, the fall of the Red Douglasses was effected; the earl and his brother were attainted, the lands divided among the chief actors, and Maxwell received as his share the lordship of Crawford Douglas and Drumsiar.

Complaints, however, of evil practices on the border could no longer be disregarded, and in 1529, while the heads of other families were imprisoned in various places, Maxwell was carried off to Edinburgh. But he was soon released. The border question was taken by the king into his own hands, and in July he succeeded in getting possession, whether honestly or otherwise is perhaps a little doubtful, of the chief cause of the late disturbances, John Armstrong, who, with a number of his men, was immediately hanged on the nearest

tree. The original charters preserved at Terregles show some curious dealings between this notorious villain and Lord Maxwell. The latter, however, was forgiven, and once more taken into royal favour. His imprisonment had, it seems, a good effect. In 1538 Sir Thomas Wharton, in writing to Cecil, declared that the western borders had never been in so quiet a state as they were then.

When James V. started for France in 1536, to marry his affianced bride, Marie de Bourbon, and ended by marrying Magdalene de Valois instead, Maxwell was one of the six persons appointed to form a Regency during the king's absence. In little more than six months the queen was dead. Mary of Lorraine was the next choice, and Maxwell, by that time Great Admiral of Scotland, was despatched in 1538, with others, to marry her by proxy.

In 1542 Henry VIII. invaded Scotland with a large force, on the highly satisfactory ground that James had refused to come to meet him at York. The real cause of dispute was James' refusal to adopt the theological vagaries his uncle was pleased to call his creed, and also the question of superiority. But the expedition had to retire without any decisive result, and in the following year Maxwell prepared, at the king's desire, to return the compliment. Ten thousand men were collected, when it was discovered, to the intense indignation of the nobles, that Oliver Sinclair, the king's unworthy favourite, was to be commander-in-chief. No person had better reason to feel insulted than Lord Maxwell. What part he really took in the matter is not quite certain, but we may hope that Knox's account is the true one. 'The Lord Maxwell perceaving what wold be the end of such begynn- ynges, stood upon his foote with his freandis, who being admonissed to tack his horse and provide for himself, ansured, "Nay, I will rather abyd hear the chance that it shall please God to send me than to go home and thare be hanged."

But the Scottish army was disorganised, and the English, learning this state of things, fell upon their enemies: the result being the disastrous defeat at Solway Moss. Lord Maxwell and many others were taken prisoners. The king was so affected by the news, that he sank in less than three weeks, just after the birth of his daughter Mary, the unfortunate Queen of Scots. The most important of the prisoners meanwhile were conveyed to London and sent to the Tower. Shortly afterwards, on being brought before the Lord Chancellor and the Star Chamber, they were committed to the

charge of certain English gentlemen, Lord Maxwell falling to the lot of Sir Anthony Brown.

In the death of James King Henry saw an opening for his own designs on Scotland, and at once decided that his son Edward, then five years of age, should marry the new-born princess. As likely to help him in this matter, he dismissed his Scotch prisoners, first of all requiring from each of these 'assured lords,' as they were then designated, the humiliating promise and bond that they would acknowledge him as Lord Superior of Scotland, do their utmost to put the government of the kingdom and its strongholds into his hands, and to have the infant princess delivered to him and brought to England. As a hostage of his fidelity, each of them was required to send a son, or some other relation, to the English Court. In the event of their failing to accomplish Henry's designs they were to return to their prisons in England on his requiring them to do so, or, if he preferred, to remain in Scotland and assist him in the war. Maxwell's pledge was his eldest son, and he was to pay a sum of 1,000 marks sterling besides by way of ransom.

During his captivity there is no doubt that, like many of the other prisoners—the Earls of Cassilis, Glencairn, and others—Maxwell became a convert to the new faith. On this view alone can we explain the part which he took in the first parliament of Queen Mary, in 1543, when he introduced a very important bill, granting liberty to all Scots to read the Bible in their own tongue. The bill was carried, and Knox tells us of the joy that spread in consequence through the whole kingdom.

Henry soon called upon his new friends to show their fidelity by help of Sadler, his ambassador in Scotland. Secret articles were readily signed; but two of the persons concerned, Maxwell and Somerville, soon got into trouble. When on their way to the Earls of Cassilis and Glencairn, they were found with letters from England in their possession, and they were thrown into prison. Maxwell seems to have been prepared with an explanation which was considered satisfactory, and we find him in a short time at Glasgow Castle, with Lord Lennox, who by this time had joined the English party. At the storming of the castle, Maxwell was again taken prisoner, but speedily released in the hopes that he would help in resisting an army from England, which Henry's impatience had despatched, and which had landed at Leith. He further received a second appointment as Warden of the West Marches.

Very naturally the English now looked on him as a traitor,



and it seems most surprising that he should have ventured on placing himself, as he did soon afterwards, in their power when recalled in 1544, and go to London. During his detention there he prepared three curious documents, called Confessions, which are still extant in the State Paper Office.\* After a lengthened imprisonment he was brought before the Privy Council, and succeeded in obtaining permission to return homewards as far as Carlisle. The castles of Carlaverock, Lochmaben, and Thrieve were all at this time the property of Lord Maxwell, and the possession of them was of great importance for an intended invasion of the west of Scotland. 'At one time promises, at another threats, were used to induce Lord Maxwell to surrender these castles and aid the English against the Scots. Unwilling to act against his country, and yet extremely desirous to obtain his liberty, his conduct became inconsistent and vacillating.' (Vol. i. p. 194.) So much was this the case that the English determined to carry him back to the Tower. Unable to endure the thoughts of another residence there, interest is again made in his behalf, and he was carried off to Pontefract instead. Soon afterwards his son was taken prisoner, and the English felt more confident of gaining possession of the coveted castles, but for a long time to no purpose. Finding at last that there was no hope of success, except in allowing Maxwell to return home in person, the English at last gave their consent, and one of Maxwell's first acts was to deliver Carlaverock into their hands. There was some real or pretended difficulty in doing so. The governor at the time was a priest, a relation of Maxwell's, and it was arranged that Maxwell should send for him to Carlisle—that certain persons should then attend him to Carlaverock, and never leave him till the castle was delivered up—if there was any stay or difficulty in the matter, he was to be got rid of. But there was no need of such ultra proceedings. The castle was surrendered, 'quhilk,' says the 'Diurnal of Occurrents,' 'was a great discomfort to the countree.' But the English after all found it no great treasure. There was nothing to take possession of but the bare walls. On one side was the sea, on the other Lochar Moss, and all around a hostile country; and the new tenants seem to have quitted their very uncomfortable quarters at the earliest opportunity. †

But meantime the Scots began to bestir themselves in the matter, and siege was laid to Lochmaben and Thrieve, at that

---

\* State Papers, Henry VIII., vol. v. p. 479.

† Burton, vol. iii. p. 448-9.

time held by two of Maxwell's sons. The castles were given up; Maxwell himself was taken prisoner, and carried as a traitor to Dumfries. He had now to make his peace as well as he could, and to answer for the treasonable bond he had entered into with the English. This he managed to do so satisfactorily, or at least so cleverly, that all his offences were forgiven, and he was appointed Chief Justiciar of Annandale, Kircudbright, Wigtown, and Dumfries, and, for the third time, Warden of the Western Marches. Lochmaben also was restored to him; but by this time trouble had worn him out, and his unquiet spirit found rest at last, for within a month of getting back that castle he died.

The sixth Lord Maxwell died young; the seventh when only four years of age; and we come to the eighth, a posthumous son. As soon as he was old enough he attached himself to the party of Queen Mary. His first appearance in public appears to have been when Lord Scrope, the Warden of the English Marches, invaded Scotland, at Elizabeth's order, immediately after the assassination of the Regent Murray, in 1570. Maxwell, though then only seventeen years of age, raised troops to oppose the English, but unsuccessfully; his castles at Dumfries and Carlaverock were destroyed; and Scrope tells his royal mistress, with great glee, that he had not left a stone house to an ill neighbour within twenty miles of Carlisle.

In 1572 Maxwell married a daughter of the Earl of Angus, and became more closely connected than before with the houses of Hamilton and Douglas, and also, through Lady Maxwell's sister, with the Scotts of Buccleuch and the Earl of Bothwell. A grand entertainment, which the Earl of Morton, Lady Maxwell's uncle, had prepared for the newly-married people, was entirely put a stop to by some of the queen's party seizing upon the wine and provisions whilst on their way to Dalkeith.

This occurrence probably shows that, for a time at least, his attachment to Mary was wavering, and, indeed, soon after his marriage he submitted to the government carried on in the name of James VI., and he is specially mentioned in the Act of Indemnity, which was passed for the security of certain persons who had 'conformed.' The Earl of Morton, who had become Regent by the end of the year, appointed him Warden of the Western Marches. At the same time he was put in possession of the Castle of Lochmaben. He performed the duties of his office so admirably that Scrope, in a letter to Lord Burleigh, says, 'Lord Maxwell and I met at a day's

'march, when we made delivery of forty-two bills. The like example of justice done in one day has not been seen or heard of in these borders.' For the interests of 'justice' this example had better remain unique.

The claim he made at this time to the earldom of Morton brought him into trouble. This earldom had been created by James II. in 1458, in favour of James Douglas, Lord of Dalkeith. The third earl had no male issue, but three daughters, of whom the eldest married the Earl of Arran, who had been made Duke of Chatelherault when Mary married the Dauphin; the second married the sixth Lord Maxwell, and the third James Douglas, brother of the Earl of Angus and afterwards Regent. A most strange settlement of the succession was made by the earl. The title was to go to the son of the youngest daughter; or, if there were no male issue, to her husband, and his brothers, and other Douglasses in succession. This was confirmed by the Crown in 1533. Maxwell, when the proper time came, objected to its legality, and claimed the title on the ground that the Duke of Chatelherault had demitted his claim to what would have been an inferior title, his son, the Earl of Arran, consenting to the arrangement, Lady Douglas had no issue, and therefore the title belonged in full right to no one but himself. The Regent tried every means to induce him to renounce his claims, but without success; and, accordingly, he soon let him feel the weight of his displeasure. He was deprived of his office of Warden of the Marches, and shortly afterwards sent a prisoner to Edinburgh, and thence to Blackness. In return, Maxwell seems to have taken a share, very naturally, in the plot to deprive the Regent of his office. Morton had to resign in 1578; James VI., then only twelve years of age, assumed the government; Maxwell was released from bondage; and we soon hear of him again as Warden of the Marches.

Complaints, however, soon began to be heard of negligence in the execution of his office, and his uncle, Lord Herries, presented an elaborate report on the borders to the Privy Council. Maxwell thoroughly disapproved of it, declared it a 'pernicious council, rather inventit vpoun malice than ony favour to the common weill,' but ended by agreeing to the conditions which had been proposed. Notwithstanding this, he was not confirmed in his appointment, which was given to Lord Herries; and orders were issued moreover that he was to give up Lochmaben to the new warden, which he was obliged to do.

For the second time the Earl of Morton, who had been rein-

stated in the supreme management of affairs, committed him to prison, for what reason is not very evident, first at Blackness and then at Edinburgh. During this imprisonment Lord Herries resigned his wardenship, which was conferred upon an old enemy of Maxwell's, one of the 'gentle Johnstons' of that ilk. There had been frequent encounters between them already, and this new appointment did not help to mend matters. 'The conferring upon a rival an office which Lord Maxwell's ancestors had held for ages was regarded by him as a studied affront, and was the origin of many disastrous conflicts, calamitous not only to the families themselves, but to the whole shire of Dumfries.' (Vol. i. p. 247.)

To avert the coming storm the Privy Council interfered, and required the two enemies to keep the peace towards each other, 'under the pain of perjury and loss of honour in time coming.' Maxwell was not long kept out of office. Two men rose high in favour with the king: Esme Stewart, Lord d'Aubigny, nephew and heir of the late Earl of Lennox, who was made first of all Earl and then Duke of Lennox, and Captain J. Stewart, afterwards Earl of Arran, that title being vacant by the forfeiture of the Hamiltons. Both of them were friends of Maxwell. Through their influence, no doubt, it was that Johnston was deprived of his wardenship, which was conferred for the third time on Lord Maxwell.

When, through the exertions of Lennox and Arran, the Regent Morton had been put to death—the instrument of execution being the 'Maiden,' which he had himself introduced into Scotland: the instrument may still be seen in the Museum of the Antiquaries Society in Edinburgh—there was nothing to prevent Maxwell from attaining the higher dignity in the peerage to which he had for some time aspired, and in 1581 accordingly he was created Earl of Morton, with its lands, baronies, royalty, and annual rents, and he was 'belted' at Holyrood House on Sunday, Oct. 29. The Earl of Angus, to whom his uncle, the Regent, had made an entail of his estates and honours, was by no means satisfied with the new arrangements. From England, whither he had fled after an unsuccessful attempt to rescue his uncle from prison, he made a raid on the Maxwell property; but a special attempt on Langholm, part of the new possessions, failed entirely.

The 'Raid of Ruthven,' in 1582, took for a while the chief power out of the hands of Lennox and his friends, and they concocted a plan, which proved unsuccessful, of seizing Holyrood and the town of Edinburgh. Lord Maxwell's conduct in the matter excited suspicion, and he only escaped apprehension

by a hurried flight. His next exploit was a curious one. The Warden of the Marches set off on a private expedition of plunder and violence, which, of course, brought his administration into deserved disrepute. Accordingly he was deprived of his office, which is conferred for the second time on the Laird of Johnston.

In the course of the following year King James escaped from his jailors, and was at once joined by the Earl of Arran. Certain transactions which presently occurred give us a strange picture of the morality of the times and the unscrupulous character of this nobleman. The earl had cast longing eyes on certain portions of the Maxwell property, the lands of Mearns and Maxwellheugh. In exchange for these he offered the barony of Kinneil. But besides the fact that the other places were old family property, Kinneil had only become the property of Arran through the forfeiture of the Hamiltons, and it might easily in some new complications go back to its former owners. When the earl found, therefore, that he could not succeed by fair means, he tried foul. There was to be a re-election of the Provost of Dumfries, a post held at that time by a natural son of Lord Herries, and a firm friend of Morton's. Arran persuaded the wife of the Laird of Johnston, who was then at court, to induce her husband to become a candidate, and, besides, sent a letter to the electors, urging them to appoint his nominee, as, being Warden of the Marches, he would be more able to keep order than anyone else. Morton, on hearing of this, assembled his men, kept Johnston forcibly out of the town, made preparations for murdering him in case of his election, and secured the post for his kinsman. Arran was not long in seeking revenge. By his influence Morton was required to deliver up all his castles on pain of treason, and two companies of soldiers were despatched to help Johnston to make an attack upon Morton. Morton, however, was equal to the occasion: the companies were dispersed; one captain was killed, the other taken prisoner. Johnston then made a raid on the Maxwell lands; Morton retaliated, and burned Johnston's principal residence, Lochwood, to the ground, boasting that he would give Lady Johnston light enough to 'set her hood.' 'This calamity,' says Mr. Fraser, 'involved in destruction not only the household furniture, but also the charter chest of the Laird of Johnston, the depository of the whole muniments of the family, containing many valuable papers, relating not only to the house of Johnston, but to the history of the borders.' (Vol. i. p. 262.) The laird himself fled to Bonshaw Tower; but Morton

invested the place, and was only persuaded to accept terms through the mediation of Lord Scrope. So mortified was the laird at this and other disasters that he died in the beginning of 1586.

The king on hearing of these proceedings was deeply incensed, and deprived Morton of his earldom. Preparations were made on a large scale for an expedition into Dumfriesshire against him, but, owing to the plague which broke out that year in Edinburgh, they came to nothing.

Morton, however, was neither daunted by these preparations, nor satisfied with the amount of mischief he had already done. He made a second raid upon the Johnston property, and 'thair brint, slew, herreit and sackit his haill barony, landis, roomes, and possessiounis, and reft and away tuik their haill quick guiddis, ther insycht and planesching in greit quantite.' He next turned his attention to the Earl of Arran. The Master of Gray, with Sir F. Walsingham's assistance, had laid a plan for his death, and Morton was only too ready to join him in it. But Arran managed to get a hint of its existence, and it had to be given up. The earl, however, now thoroughly frightened, attempted to make overtures to Morton, but unsuccessfully; and before the year was over, Morton was engaged in a new plot against his enemy. This involved an invasion on a large scale into Scotland by the Earls of Angus, and Mar, and others, who were then in exile. Morton had a large force ready for use, originally intended for an attack on the Johnstons, to the number of 1,300 foot and 700 horse. With these he joined the conspirators, and the conjoined forces marched on Stirling, where the king then was, which they soon captured. That same evening they had an interview with the king, and disclaimed all hostile intentions towards himself. In one point only they were unsuccessful. Arran escaped, but only to fall, after a miserable life in the wilds of Ayrshire, by the nephew of the Morton he had been the means of destroying, James Douglas of Torthorwald. The banished lords were forgiven, and their pardon proclaimed by the sound of the trumpet. Soon afterwards Maxwell was restored to his forfeited honours, and this though at the same time the forfeiture of the Regent Morton was rescinded.

Notwithstanding this, we soon find him again in his old quarters in the Castle of Edinburgh. He had gone in procession from Dumfries to Lincluden and caused mass to be openly celebrated there, although very stringent laws had been passed against it. The Privy Council required of him

that he should promise 'to attempt nothing prejudicial to the true preaching of the Evangel then professed within the realm under the pain of 1,000*l.*, and that he should accept of a minister with whom he might confer for his better resolution on the head of religion.' He was then set at liberty, but if this ghostly counsellor was ever appointed, we pity the minister.

Once more he became Warden of the Marches. The death of Mary Queen of Scots in 1587, roused the indignation of the Catholics in Scotland against Queen Elizabeth, and none rejoiced more than Morton to hear of the preparations for a Spanish invasion. He undertook a journey into Spain in person—put himself into communication with the Court—inspected the preparations that were being made and promised all possible assistance. On returning home he found that he had fallen into disgrace, that his appointment of Warden had been cancelled, and the office given to Lord Herries. As he had come back without the formal permission he had undertaken to procure, he was proclaimed a traitor that had designs against the established religion. Forces were gathered to attack Lochmaben, whilst the king himself marched on Dumfries. Maxwell, who was in his house in that town, received warning of the king's advance only an hour before his actual arrival, and was almost surprised by the king's troops. He fled to Kircudbright, where he found a ship in which he went off, but he was pursued and captured. Langholm, Thrieve, and Carlarverock were surrendered, and Lochmaben closely invested. Induced by a letter professing to be in the king's handwriting, but afterwards declared to be a forgery, David Maxwell gave up possession, and, with fifty men of the garrison, was at once hanged for his confidence. Seventeen also of those on board the ship in which Maxwell was captured were doomed to the gallows. The king then returned to Edinburgh, taking Maxwell with him, whom he committed to the custody of Sir William Stewart.

Meanwhile the great Armada had been utterly defeated and dispersed. Maxwell, Lord Claud Hamilton, and the Earl of Huntley tried to urge Philip to make a fresh attempt, offering all possible assistance. Their letter was intercepted, and is now in the State Paper Office. But whatever promises of help might have reached Philip, he had no heart to stir again in the matter. In 1589 Maxwell was again set free, having signed an agreement 'under the pain of one hundred thousand poundis money of the realm' to be a faithful and obedient subject for the future. He was also appointed one of the Commissioners to assist Lord Hamilton who had been made

Lord Lieutenant of the kingdom, whilst James was off in Norway to bring home his bride, and once more he is gazetted as Warden of the Marches.

His next proceeding is somewhat startling. 'On Friday, January 26, 1593, Lord Maxwell, whether from policy or conviction may be questioned, subscribed the Confession of Faith, under the title of Earl of Morton, before the presbytery of Edinburgh.' He promised to be ready whenever the kirk should employ him. 'At this time so much was he in disfavour with the barons and gentlemen of Galloway that on the previous day they boldly said to King James that they would not have one of their own companions, meaning Maxwell, to be their king, and that if his Majesty denied them his protection, they would submit themselves to a foreign sovereign.' (Vol. i. p. 287.)

Troubles again appeared on the borders. The Johnstons, headed by William Johnston of Wamphray, devastated the lands of Lord Crichton of Sanquhar. A long procession of poor women, who had lost relations and goods in the raid, made their way to Edinburgh; and though at first the Privy Council gave no heed to their petition, the people were so enraged at the sight of the blood-stained relics which were carried in procession through the streets, that it was found advisable to issue instructions to Maxwell to take the necessary proceedings against the guilty persons. In December 1593, accordingly, Maxwell was ready to take the field, but intelligence of what was going on had been given to the Johnstons and they were fully prepared for the emergency. A reconnoitring party was surprised, some of the persons killed, and Lochmaben Castle, to which others had fled for refuge, burnt to the ground.

Maxwell, not discouraged, crossed the Lochmaben hills and met the Johnstons, who had taken up a very strong position. Notwithstanding this, and though he could not get more than half of his forces into action at once, Maxwell did not hesitate to attack. But valour could do little or nothing under such circumstances; his men were soon thrown into a panic and fled in confusion, and Maxwell himself fell, but by whose hand is uncertain: one account making him killed by a Johnston, another saying that after being mortally wounded, he was despatched by a woman with the keys of Kirkton Tower, which she was carrying at her girdle. Two large thorn trees, called Maxwell's trees, long marked the place where he was slain, but they were carried away about half a century ago when the waters of the Dryfe was greatly swollen. 'The



‘Maxwells and the confederate barons suffered grievously in the retreat; many were overtaken in the streets of Locherby or slashed in the face by the pursuers, a kind of blow which to this day is called in that country a “Locherby Lick.”’\* Mr. Fraser tells us that Sir W. Scott is incorrect in many particulars of this battle of Dryfe Sands, ‘adopting too implicitly the loosest of tradition, and drawing too much on ‘imagination.’ Between the 700 whom he represents as perishing in the waters of the Annan on this occasion, and a contemporary account which mentions only five persons as killed, we may safely take some intermediate number as the true one. ‘Maxwell’s fall,’ says Spottiswoode, ‘was pitied of many, for that he was not known to have done much injury in his time, and was rather hurtful to himself than others.’ He was only forty years of age at the time of his death, and was buried in Lincluden.

The king was at first highly enraged at the slaughter of his Warden, but in less than a year a royal pardon is granted to the offenders, and so for a time the matter came to an end. But the Johnstons were by no means satisfied. In 1595 Lord Herries, then Warden, was attacked by them whilst in the execution of his duty, his prisoners rescued, and Sir John Maxwell of Pollok, with others, left dead on the field. The Government attempted to interfere, but to no purpose; and matters were made still worse when Lord Herries was deprived of his office, and Sir James Johnston of Dunskenlie appointed in his stead. This, too, had to be cancelled, and in little more than a year Lord Ochiltree was made Warden. But the disturbances still continued, and finally the laird of Johnston was declared rebel, his portrait hung at the Cross of Edinburgh head downwards, and all the king’s subjects forbidden to have any intercourse with him. The following year the Government tried what imprisonment would do, and Johnston, together with Lord Herries and Sir James Douglas of Drumlanrig, was placed in confinement. What promises Johnston made during his detention we cannot tell, but within a year he was not only set at liberty and restored to his honours, but was once again appointed Warden of the Marches and Justiciar.

The ninth Lord Maxwell and second Earl of Morton was for a time kept out of mischief by being imprisoned at Edinburgh for favouring Popery. In accordance with a resolution of the General Assembly, which ordered that ministers should wait upon the noblemen who professed the Roman Catholic

religion, and remain with them for a quarter of a year continually, to confirm them and their families in the truth. Mr. Henry Blyth was appointed to do this kindly office for Maxwell. In a few months' time he contrived to escape, and at once proceeded to take vengeance on his hereditary foes. He burnt a few of their houses, men and all; but, perhaps, finding no means of doing effectual mischief, he executed 'letters of 'Slannis,' in which he forgave all former wrongs and offences. It may, however, be doubted, says Mr. Fraser, 'whether Lord 'Maxwell really felt the placable spirit which those letters 'seem to breathe.'

Next year (1606) Maxwell is again ordered into confinement at Leith on account of his religion; but his detention, if ever carried out, must have been soon annulled, for in 1607 we find him anxious to settle in the field a question in dispute about the right and title of Earl of Morton against William Douglas, of Lochhorn, who had become entitled to that designation on the death of the restored Earl of Angus. The Privy Council ordered them to disband their forces, which Maxwell declined to do, and challenged his adversary to single combat. For this disobedience Maxwell went back to his old quarters in Edinburgh Castle. He had been there only eight weeks, when, with characteristic daring and determination, he managed to escape. After climbing the wall, he got off on a horse which had been kept in readiness for him. The king was very angry on hearing the news, and would gladly have proceeded against him on a charge of high treason, about which, however, there were legal difficulties. But, notwithstanding the proclamation issued for his apprehension, he travelled openly through the country, attended by no less than twenty horse, and went several times to Dumfries. But so strict were the orders for his apprehension, that he was kept in a state of constant alarm. One of his hiding places, in Clawbelly Hill, is still called Maxwell's Cave. Under these circumstances he was very much disposed to come to an understanding with the Johnstons. There was a person admirably fitted to act as mediator between them, Sir Robert Maxwell, of Orchardstane, Lord Maxwell's cousin and Johnston's brother-in-law. An arrangement was made for a meeting—each was to be accompanied by a single attendant, and only Sir R. Maxwell besides was to be present. The meeting took place—promises of friendship and forgiveness were interchanged, and all seemed to promise an amicable settlement, when Maxwell's attendant, Charles Maxwell, rode suddenly and against orders towards Johnston's attendant, and, after some hot words, fired his

pistol at him. The laird was coming up to his friend's assistance, when Maxwell levelled his weapon at him, and Johnston fell mortally wounded. Maxwell, well satisfied with this vengeance on the man who had slain his father, rode away. That very day, and apparently before the deed was perpetrated, he granted to Charles Maxwell a charter of some lands at Numballie, 'for a certain sum of money paid, and also for good, faithful, and gratuitous services rendered, and to be rendered to him by the grantee.' 'The granting of such a charter,' says Mr. Fraser, 'on the very day when the granter made such dire use of the services of the grantee, is somewhat suspicious, although it is just possible that it was a singular coincidence.' The evident determination on the part of Maxwell's attendant to force on a quarrel, if the accounts we have are to be depended on, leave little doubt that some foul play or other was intended to be perpetrated at the meeting.

Maxwell made his escape to France. In his absence he was sentenced to death as a traitor, and to the confiscation of all his property. In 1612, however, he ventured to return with two or three persons outlawed like himself, without the king's permission. On its becoming known that he was in the country, he was hunted down so rigorously that he determined to seek safety once more in flight. But the Earl of Caithness, a relation of his, persuaded him to take refuge in his castle at Sinclair until a favourable opportunity should present itself for his escape. The earl, however, meant all the while to betray him, and this was easily effected. Maxwell, almost immediately upon leaving the castle, was apprehended by some of the earl's men, and carried to Edinburgh. 'It is a satisfaction to know that Sinclair was unsuccessful in obtaining from the Government any reward for this base treachery, which entailed indelible infamy upon himself and brought reproach upon his family.' (Vol. i. p. 320.)

The Johnstons now moved the Government with all their influence—the old grandmother of the then laird going to Edinburgh in person—to have the sentence that had been pronounced against him in his absence carried into effect. Maxwell made a final attempt at reconciliation. He was profuse in his offers; he even undertook, his first wife being dead, to marry the daughter of the man he had slain 'without any tocher,' and he would leave the country for seven years, or longer, if the Laird of Johnston wished it. But it was in vain. The Earl of Rochester, a friend of the Johnstons, was high in favour at Court at that period; and on May 22, 1613, Maxwell was executed in the Market Place at Edinburgh. 'Thus was

‘ finally ended,’ says Sir W. Scott, ‘ by a salutary example of severity, this “foul debate” between the Maxwells and the Johnstons—in the course of which each family lost two chieftains, one dying of a broken heart, one in the field of battle, one by assassination, and one by the sword of the executioner.’\*

His brother Robert succeeded to an empty heritage. The Maxwell honours had been forfeited and the lands given to others. But brighter days came; the king ordered a special grant of 200*l.* out of the exchequer; the lands were gradually regained, and finally, in 1620, the earldom was restored to the Maxwells. In consideration, however, of the hatred that had always existed between the families of Morton and Maxwell, and the great inconvenience of having two earls in the kingdom of the same name, the king, of his sole authority, changed the title from Morton to Nithsdale, a far more appropriate one for the family than the old one had been. His precedence, however, was to date from the earlier creation in 1581. He successfully resisted a charge of 200 marks which the Lyon King of Arms had demanded of him as a newly created lord of parliament, and he was equally successful against ten earls, created after 1581, who questioned his precedency. Monetary embarrassments however still continued, and creditors at times were inclined to resort to harsh measures against him. Among other persons to whom he applied for assistance was George Heriot; but the wealthy jeweller was as cautious as became a Scot and ‘doubtful.’ ‘I am sorie,’ the earl says in a letter to Lord Arran, ‘that George Hariot is put in such fear and distast with me, as I here be Sir George he is, for his securitie may be good enough, if he wald he pleasit to furnis sum monie.’† In the king, however, he found a better friend, who notified pretty clearly to the persons concerned that they had better take no further steps until they understood his pleasure in the matter.

At the time of the king’s death he was at Denmark House anxious to have measures taken for curbing the excessive powers which the Earls of Mar and Melrose were at that time exercising in Scotland. The funeral brought of course many Scottish noblemen to London, and especially the Earls of Morton and Roxburgh, whom Nithsdale tried to urge to watch jealously over their country’s liberties. So far however were they from listening, that no sooner did they return home

---

\* *Border Minstrelsy*, vol. ii. pp. 133–153.

† *Melrose Papers*, vol. i. p. 544.

than they began to aspire to the exercise of unlimited power themselves.

In October 1625, occurred the strange scenes described by Burnet, when Nithsdale attended a Convention of Estates held at Edinburgh, respecting the revocation of grants that James had made to his nobility and other favourites, or what they had themselves usurped of the titles and benefices of the Romish Church. The proposition was naturally most unpopular with the people concerned—the old blind Earl of Belhaven sat dagger in hand, ready for argument ‘in the old ‘Scottish manner.’ The earl was fain to disguise his instructions and get back safely to London.

In the Danish war with the Emperor Ferdinand II., Nithsdale, with considerable difficulty, raised a body of 3,000 Scots to help King Christian; but though he got his troops safe to the Continent, he had to return without any definite result. Matters nearer home soon afterwards engaged his attention, and in 1638 he fortified his castle at Carloverock, ornamenting it with numerous heraldic decorations, but two years afterwards, as we have seen already, it was taken and destroyed.

To the last he continued a faithful follower of his king. He got himself into trouble by his share in Lord Antrim’s plan of sending an Irish force to help Charles against the Parliament. In 1645 he was with Montrose at Dumfries, after which the royalists had to retreat. In 1646 he was with Lord Digby, when he was routed at Sherborne in Yorkshire. Meanwhile his estates had been sequestered and himself excommunicated. Shortly afterwards he made his escape to the Isle of Man, where he died the same year.

The second Earl of Nithsdale, Robert, had also his share in the distresses of his time. In 1644 he was taken prisoner at Newcastle, when that place was stormed by General Leslie, and sent to Edinburgh, no longer as usual with noblemen, to the Castle, but to the Tolbooth. Here he continued prisoner till the defeat of the Covenanters by Montrose, at Kilsyth, August 1, 1645. So reduced were the family circumstances at this time that Mearns had to be disposed of which had been in possession of the Maxwells for 400 years. He was commonly called the ‘Philosopher,’ and had the reputation also of being an astrologer, having cast the horoscope of Charles II., and foretold his restoration. These accomplishments, however, he indignantly repudiates.

The ‘Philosopher’ died unmarried, and was succeeded by his cousin, Lord Herries, as third Lord Nithsdale. He too had suffered severely during the civil wars. In 1639, when the

Covenanters invaded Nithsdale, he fled to Carlisle, where he remained three months. In his absence his house at Terregles was forcibly entered, and the best of his furniture and some of his plate carried off. In 1644 he was excommunicated, and the same year, for joining Montrose at Dumfries, his life and property were pronounced forfeited by the Commissioners of Estates. Beyond this he seems to have taken no part in Montrose's career, at first so victorious, but which terminated so disastrously at Philiphaugh. Fined 10,000*l.* Scots in 1647; quartered upon first by the Royalists, and afterwards by the Covenanters; charged with nine months' maintenance of troops, Lord Herries had a hard time of it; and he presented a petition for redress, which though favourably listened to, did him so little real good that in 1661 he estimated his losses at 77,332*l.* 12*s.* Scots. To this Lord Herries Abercrombie\* ascribes a History of Scotland, the only portion of which now existing is to be found in a MS. in the Library of the Faculty of Advocates at Edinburgh. It was printed by the Abbotsford Club in 1836, under the title 'Historical Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Mary of Scots, and a portion of the History of King James the Sixth; by Lord Herries.' If not always to be relied on, it is still a work of considerable importance and interest. Its real author will perhaps never be certainly known; but Mr. Fraser brings forward some strong evidence in favour of its being of higher antiquity than the date adopted by Abercrombie.

Passing by the fourth Earl of Nithsdale, who demands no special notice from us, we come to William, the last earl of the name. In 1715 he at once joined the ranks of the Old Pretender. But for his being a Romanist he would have been placed at the head of the movement in the north of Scotland, which was accordingly entrusted to Lord Kenmure. But when their forces, after a short gleam of success, were obliged to surrender at Preston, Nithsdale's 'bonnie lord' was among the number of those taken prisoner and sent to the Tower. Though no history of the Maxwells would be complete without some notice of what followed, we cannot do here more than remind our readers of the loving devotion and successful bravery of the lovely, accomplished, and famous heroine, Lady Winifred Herbert, daughter of the Marquis of Powys, and Countess of Nithsdale. This much however we may say, that the story of the escape, told so simply and yet so touchingly by

---

\* Martial Achievements of the Scots' Nation. 1715.

the countess, in a letter to her sister who was Abbess of the English Augustine Nuns at Bruges, is given at length by Mr. Fraser, together with two pages of facsimiles, in his second volume. His version, which differs in many places from the hitherto published copies, is taken from the original letter now in the possession of Lord Herries. The signature is gone, evidently taken by or for some voracious collector of autographs.

The earl and countess took up their residence on the Continent, and especially at Rome. It is sad to find from their letters, many of which are here printed, to what straits they were often reduced. The earl died in 1744, the year before the second attempt of the Stuarts to recover their former kingdom. The countess survived him for five years. The forfeited earldom has never been restored.

The only surviving son succeeded to the Nithsdale and Herries estates on the death of his father, the necessary documents for proving the conveyance of these estates to him before the earl's attainder having been lodged in a place of security by Lady Nithsdale. Family troubles had taught him wisdom, and he took no share in the rising of '45, though his letters show that his heart was very much in the matter, and no one would have been more ready than himself to join the movement if there had been any reasonable hopes of success. The 'lazy lord,' as his wife called him, found more charms in a quiet and retired life. His only children were daughters, one of whom died unmarried, the other, Winifred, became the wife of Mr. W. H. Constable, of Everingham, in Yorkshire, the grandfather of the present Lord Herries. Under what circumstances this title was restored will be explained presently.

Besides the Maxwells already mentioned, Mr. Fraser has given us a very interesting account of the fourth Lord Herries of Terregles, who was so intimately connected with Mary Queen of Scots. We can give but the merest outline of his life here, and must even pass by such curious passages as his 'tragic wooing of the border heiress,' which Mr. Fraser has described. In his tenure of the office of Warden of the Marches he reminds us of the eighth Lord Maxwell, who appears and disappears with the vagaries of a will-o'-the-wisp. Nor was it only in this matter that this 'smooth-tongued plausible person,' as Froude describes him,\* gave proofs of his versatility. At one time Mary's most trusted friend, at another exciting her suspicions; in 1565 imploring the protection of Elizabeth against the enemies, with whom he is within a month joined

---

\* History of England, vol. ix. p. 166.

heart and hand; riding one day to Edinburgh to remonstrate with his sovereign on her intended marriage with Bothwell, and in 'a few weeks' time recommending him to her as a husband; labouring in August for her release from Loch Leven, in December astonishing his friends by a speech in Parliament in which he recognised the authority of the king and regent, and that very same month binding himself to hazard his life for the queen. No wonder Throgmorton used of him the strong language he used to Cecil: 'The Lord Herryes ys the conynge horseleache and the wysest of the wholle faction, but as the Quene of Scotland sayethe of hym, there ys no bodye can be sure of hym: he takethe pleasure to beare all the worlde in hande: we have good occasyon to be well ware of him. Sir, yow remember how he handled us when he delyvered Dunfryse, Carlaverocke, and the Harmytage into our handes. He made us beleave all should be ours to the Frythe, and when wec trusted hym best, how he helped to chase us awaye, I am sure you have not forgotten. Here amongst hys owne countreyemen he ys noted to be the moost cautelous man of hys natyon. It may lyke you to remember he suffred hys owne hostages, the hostages of the Lard of Loughanver and Garles hys nexte neyghboures and frendes, to be hanged for promesse broken by hym. Thys muche I speake of hym, because he ys the lykelyest and moost dangerous man to inchaunte yow.' He died suddenly at last in Edinburgh. He was on his way at the time to the lodgings of one William Fowler, 'in the time of sermon, to hear the boys bicker,' when he fell down and expired.

But it is time to give some account of the able and valuable volumes for which we are almost entirely indebted for the materials used in the foregoing sketch of the Maxwells. These, with some other volumes equally valuable, owe their existence to the following circumstances. In 1848 the descendants of the Earl of Nithsdale were restored in blood, and Mr. W. Constable Maxwell of Nithsdale and Everingham presented a petition to the House of Lords, in which he prayed to have the title and honours of Lord Herries of Terregles restored to him. The earliest notice of the name of Herries occurs as far back as 1160, when William de Heryz witnessed a donation of Henry Prince of Scotland to the monasteries of Wederhall (Wetheral) and Holme Cultram, in Cumberland. The first knight of the family was John Herries, who received from King David Bruce a charter in which Terregles was created a barony in 1364. Sir Hubert Herries sat as a 'Lord of Parliament' in 1489, and perhaps this was the time when the family was first



raised to the peerage; but the original documents connected with the creation have all perished. The second lord was slain at Flodden; the third was the Lord Herries whose eldest daughter, as we have seen, married Sir John Maxwell, afterwards Lord Herries by a new creation. When the male descendants of Sir John's eldest brother, Robert the sixth Lord Maxwell, terminated in the Earl of Nithsdale, who died in 1667, the descendants of Lord Herries became the representatives of both the Maxwell and Herries peerages. But the question to be decided was whether the heirs male only or the heirs female could claim the honours. Mr. Maxwell's petition accordingly was opposed by Mr. W. Maxwell of Carruchan, on the ground that he was the eldest male heir, and as such entitled to the titles of Earl of Nithsdale, Lord Maxwell, and Lord Herries. The House of Lords in 1858 decided, as far as the Herries was concerned, in favour of the heirs female. Had Mr. Maxwell of Carruchan been successful he would not have long enjoyed his victory, for in 1863 he died without issue, and in him the Carruchan branch of the Maxwells became extinct. He had however been fortunate enough to engage the services of Mr. Fraser, whose name is so well known in connexion with the history of Scottish families, and we rejoice to think that the results of his researches were not thrown away when the Maxwell case was decided. The first fruits appeared in two goodly quartos: 'Memoirs of the Maxwells of Pollok,' the oldest of all the branches of the Maxwell family, which were published in 1863. In 1865 he edited 'Inventories of the Muniments of the families of Maxwell, Herries, and Nithsdale in the Charter Room at Terregles,' a work of which unfortunately no more than twenty copies were printed. 'Before that volume was completed,' he says, 'the late Mr. Marmaduke Maxwell of Terregles arranged that I should undertake a history of the families of Maxwell and Herries, and also edit the printing of their charters and correspondence. The results of the eight years' labour upon a subject which had previously so long engaged my attention, now appears in the present work, under the general title of "*The Book of Carluverock*," a title sufficiently appropriate for a record of the house of Maxwell, as the castle of that name, so celebrated in history for its memorable sieges, is now the oldest inheritance of the family.' (Pref. p. xii.) The earldom of Nithsdale has not been restored; and if there are in existence any persons that can claim the title in the male line, they must be sought for apparently among the descendants, if any, of William Maxwell, the representative of the Maxwells of Breconside in

Kirkgunzeon, who was first of all 'a merchant at Bristol, and afterwards went to New York.

But we cannot take leave of this distinguished family, whose fortunes we have followed so long, without a passing allusion to the last and not the least illustrious of its alliances. In the course of this year Joseph, the third son of the present Lord Herries, has allied himself in marriage to Mary Monica, only surviving child of the late James Hope-Scott, the granddaughter of John Gibson Lockhart, the great-granddaughter and sole lineal representative of Sir Walter Scott—names dear to Scotland, dear to literature, dear to ourselves, for they revive the traditions of past years, and they point, we trust, to a long and happy future. The estates and heirlooms of Abbotsford will thus pass into a branch of the Maxwell family, allied to the great name of Scott, and Maccuswell returns to the enchanted banks of the Tweed.

ART. III.—1. *London Lyrics.* By FREDERICK LOCKER. New Edition. London: 1874.

2. *The Courtly Poets from Raleigh to Montrose.* Edited by J. HANNAH, D.C.L. London: 1870.

3. *The Poems of Winthrop Mackworth Praed.* With a Memoir by the Rev. DERWENT COLERIDGE. London: 1864.

4. *The Greek Anthology.* By Lord NEAVES. Edinburgh: 1874.

5. *Lyra Elegantiarum.* A Collection of some of the best Specimens of *Vers de Société* in the English Language. Edited by F. LOCKER. London: 1864.

6. *Two Centuries of Song.* With Critical and Biographical Notes by WALTER THORNBURY. London: 1866.

IN poetry and creative art the ancient world left little or no room in which the modern could demonstrate its superiority. Science has multiplied the appliances for the diffusion of knowledge, and invention has achieved many and extraordinary triumphs, but the individual mind has not shown itself capable of higher flights of imagination than those of the old poets. In these later centuries we have seen but one poet capable of sustaining the mantle of Homer. And the superiority of the ancients is equally undoubted when we consider those slighter efforts in verse which are confessedly of a somewhat ephemeral character, and meant principally to embody only the feelings of the age in which they are written. Horace was the

best writer of light lyrical verse whom the world has seen, while, at the same time, he was something much greater and higher. But regarding him in this passing reference mainly as a poet of society, what higher compliment can we pay to a poet of our own time than to say that he is truly Horatian in spirit, or writes with the Horatian pen? But Horace himself was not the father of this fugitive poetry. The Roman poet acknowledges that Anacreon was its originator; but whether that be so or no, the Anthology is full of excellent examples of it, and the earliest known specimens now in existence were left by the Greeks.

‘Nec, si quid olim lusit Anacreon,  
Delevit ætas; spirat adhuc amor,  
Vivuntque commissi calores  
Æoliæ fidibus puellæ.’

Great proficiency was attained in all forms of song, the amatory, the didactic, the literary and artistic, the witty and satirical, and others. The poems themselves have occupied the leisure of men of eminence in the modern world, and were ‘favourite objects of study with Erasmus and his friend Sir Thomas More.’ Chesterfield, it is true, denounced the Greek epigrams in his Letters to his son, but against his solitary testimony—which in this matter is of no particular weight—is to be set that of Cowper, Johnson, and many other men of equally opposite temperaments, to whom they were a solace and a delight. Lord Neaves (himself no mean proficient in the art of gay and gaillard rhymes) observes, in his very graceful little volume, that ‘from the time of Martial the epigram came to be characterised generally by that peculiar point or sting, which we now look for in a French or English epigram, and the want of this in the old Greek compositions doubtless led some minds to think them tame and tasteless. The true or the best form of the early Greek epigram does not aim at wit or seek to produce surprise. Its purpose is to set forth in the shortest, simplest and plainest language, but yet with perfect purity and even elegance of diction, some fact or feeling of such interest as would prompt the real or supposed speaker to record it in the form of an epigram; though it is true that, particularly in the later period of epigrammatic writing, these compositions, even among the Greeks, assumed a greater variety of aspect, and were employed as the vehicle of satire or ridicule, as a means of producing hilarity and mirth.’ It would be tedious to trace the gradual developments and changes in this kind of verse from the days of the first Greek

writers to the time of Horace. The latter, however, seems to have conserved many of its best elements, and to have added others which gave him so distinctive a place that, even more than his predecessors in the art, he has become a type for modern poets. His imitators for the most part serve but to denote the painful difference there is between the founder of a style and he who attempts to copy it. Our purpose is not to institute a comparison between the Roman poet's work and that of his successors, but to glance at the songs of those English writers who, taking him to a great extent as their model, have written the verse of passing moods and emotions, and have not attempted that higher branch of poetry which secures the loftiest renown from posterity.

What do we mean by *vers de société* if, with Mr. Locker, we must use a French phrase to denote a thing as old as the English language? They are the expression of common sentiment and common feeling in graceful but familiar rhyme. Poetry of this kind excites in us no wonder, no unwonted excitement; but it pleases us because, apparently without effort, it has translated into verse the ordinary sensations of humanity, those which change with the hour, which are again and again renewed, and which are the property of almost every nature. For instance, when a writer of *vers de société* gives us his impressions of female beauty, they are usually drawn from those points of view which belong to common æsthetics, and not from that hidden deeper spring of beauty which has in it something of the spiritual, and which requires the soul of the true poet rightly to apprehend. The arch smile, the dress, the peach-like bloom of the cheek—these are the things which arrest the eye of the poet of society just as they are the things which strike the vast majority of men.

He who writes of the world must mingle with the world. The most successful and the most brilliant of the school of authors to which we are referring have been those who have lived largely in society; who have studied its movements, its caprices, and its spirit. They have generally been men of ease and observation, and yet men of no settled purpose as regards the expression of their thoughts. They have not so much sought the muse as left the muse to come to them; when she has given them an *à propos* inspiration they have written. The pen has served as a medium to turn a compliment, to secure a fleeting idea, or to enshrine a random reflection. Such an end may seem trivial, but the result in the bulk of these verses has been most abundant. What a glance at contemporary history we obtain from the time of Raleigh down to

our own day through the aid of our minor English poetry ! It is as trustworthy as a book of costume, with the addition of a living human interest.

Writers of fugitive verses hang, as it were, upon the skirts of the greater poets of their own time, and all that they do takes a tinge from them. Accordingly, we find that the minor verse of the Elizabethan period possesses a nobler expression and a greater sweetness than that of the nineteenth century, from the fact that it was an echo of that sublime period in English literature. The satellites of Shakspeare, Spenser, and Jonson were likely to emit a stronger radiance than those of Wordsworth, Byron, or Tennyson. The grace of the first writers of this humbler poesy has never been surpassed. With every century there has been a corresponding change between the two kinds of verse, though the age must also be counted as a factor in the production of such general result.

The writing of this poetry, simple as it appears, requires special gifts. In the first place, terseness is an especial requisite. To be verbose in verse which, as it were, flies with the wind, is to fail in the first principle of the art. The best writer of society verse is always happiest when he is concentrated. Light verse written in cantos—unless it took the form of a humorous or satirical narrative like ‘Don Juan’—would fatigue the reader. It is not the highest kind of genius which devotes itself to this work, and the verbosity which we could tolerate, if we could not always enjoy, in the greater writer becomes insufferable in the lesser. The man who writes *vers de société* must have as decided a gift in his own form of expression and conception as the artist who takes a higher rank. To quote the words of Isaac D’Israeli:—‘It must not be supposed that because these productions are concise they have, therefore, the more facility; we must not consider the genius of a poet diminutive because his pieces are so, nor must we call them, as a sonnet has been called, a difficult trifle. A circle may be very small, yet it may be as mathematically beautiful and perfect as a larger one. To such compositions we may apply the observation of an ancient critic, that though a little thing gives perfection, yet perfection is not a little thing. The poet to succeed in these hazardous pieces must be alike polished by an intercourse with the world as with the studies of taste, to whom labour is negligence, refinement a science, and art a nature. Genius will not always be sufficient to impart that grace of amenity which seems peculiar to those who are accustomed to elegant society. . . . These productions are more the effusions of taste than genius,

‘and it is not sufficient that the poet is inspired by the Muse, he must also suffer his concise pages to be polished by the hand of the Graces.’

Steele, who himself regarded Sappho, Anacreon, and Horace as the completest models in this range of verse, was the author of a charming paper in his ‘Guardian,’ which really exhausts the subject. ‘These little things,’ he says, ‘do not require an elevation of thought, nor any extraordinary capacity, nor an extensive knowledge; but then they demand great regularity and the utmost nicety; an exact purity of style, with the most easy and flowing numbers; an elegant and unaffected turn of wit, with one uniform and simple design. Greater works cannot well be without some inequalities and oversights, and they are in them pardonable: but a song loses all its lustre if it be not polished with the greatest accuracy. The smallest blemish in it, like a flaw in a jewel, takes off the whole value of it. A song is, as it were, a little image in enamel, that requires all the nice touches of the pencil, a gloss, and a smoothness, with those delicate finishing strokes which would be superfluous and thrown away upon larger figures, where the strength and boldness of a masterly hand give all the grace.’ This description of what a song should be is extremely felicitous, and covers the ground which we are desirous to include within the scope of the present article. Steele considers the ancient writers whom he names great in the art because they pursue a single thought, whereas the moderns cram too much into one song. Waller occasionally commits this error, while Cowley is defective through a redundancy of wit. The reader is dazzled by the starting of so many trains of thought, whereas a song should be constructed as we would construct an epigram.

The limitation to which we have committed ourselves will forbid an examination of the claims of those who on the Continent first cultivated the art of light versification. But even were the scope widened it would be practically impossible to touch upon the French and Italian writers from the time of the Troubadours and of Ronsard downwards who have attained great proficiency in spontaneous and courtly verse. The two countries named were more prolific in a single age; perhaps, than England has been in the course of three centuries in the production of these writers. But besides their excellency in the construction of songs and lyrics, the Italians perfected another style which finds an admirable exponent in Boiardo, the author of the ‘Orlando Innamorato,’ and in Berni, who is remembered principally for his *Rifacimento* of that celebrated

work. This style is full of episode and description, and although the element of lightness may be often discovered in it, it is scarcely germane to our subject. Boiardo's style was first imitated in this country within the present century by Hookham Frere, in 'Whistlecraft,' and afterwards by Byron in 'Beppo,' and 'Don Juan.' But comic epic, or mock heroic poetry, notwithstanding that it possesses the one feature of familiarity common also to lighter verse, is removed from the true subject of this inquiry. In the one we have many trains of ideas started; in the other we have the bending of the energies to the complete grasping and setting forth of one leading thought. So in familiar poetry: 'Don Juan' presents us with a series of pictures, but real fugitive verse expends itself in the perfection of one. The power of improvisation, which was so remarkable a feature of the Italian poetic genius generally, and of the French at certain spasmodic periods, has been almost wholly absent in England. We have no parallel to the court of King René, which swarmed with singers of no mean order and musicians of a sweet and delicate if not powerful melody. We are a heavy and practical, in distinction from a light and sunny race; and our accomplishments in fugitive verse cannot for grace and elegance be ranged in comparison with those of France and Italy. Such as we are, we are, however; and we shall doubtless discover that in other important respects our writers have the superiority over Continental poets.

Arriving now at a consideration of some of the riches of the English literature as regards this attractive class of poetry, let us first devote a brief space to those writers who flourished before the time of Waller. Much of the best verse issued from the versifiers of the sixteenth century and the earlier portion of the seventeenth. In the lyrics of that period we are struck with the especial beauty and sweetness of many whose authorship is unknown. It speaks well for the popular taste, notwithstanding, that though the authors have long since crumbled into dust, their work has been preserved and handed down from generation to generation.

Most of these old poems touch upon the passion of love, and in none has the thought been better conveyed than in Ben Jonson's address to Celia, which, familiar as it is, can never be read without delight:—

'Drink to me only with thine eyes,  
And I will pledge with mine;  
Or leave a kiss but in the cup  
And I'll not look for wine.

The thirst that from the soul doth rise  
 Doth ask a drink divine;  
 But might I of Jove's nectar sup,  
 I would not change for thine.'

A lightness and an intensity are combined here so perfectly as to make the gem complete. The language is of the simplest, is free and unrestrained, and the idea exceedingly pretty. Now and then in these earlier days we light upon verses in which the feeling of melancholy predominates, as in those soft and somewhat sad lines by Carew, which would seem to have been penned after a rebuff sustained at the hands of the cruel fair one :—

'He that loves a rosy cheek  
 Or a coral lip admires,  
 Or from star-like eyes doth seek  
 Fuel to maintain his fires;  
 As old Time makes these decay,  
 So his flames must waste away.  
 But a smooth and steadfast mind,  
 Gentle thoughts, and calm desires,—  
 Hearts with equal love combined,  
 Kindle never-dying fires;  
 Where these are not, I despise  
 Lovely cheeks, or lips, or eyes.'

It would be a task to scrutinise at length the varied lyrical treasures of the Elizabethan era, as we have received them from the pens of Wither, Sir Henry Wotton, Donne, Cowley, Sir Philip Sidney, Sir Robert Ayton, Sir Walter Raleigh, and others. Raleigh was a master in the art of verse, though his superiority in other respects has somewhat detracted from his fame in this. Everybody, however, remembers his reply to Marlowe's song of the 'Passionate Shepherd to his Love,' beginning—

'If all the world and love were young,  
 And truth in every shepherd's tongue,  
 These pretty pleasures might me move  
 To live with thee and be thy love.'

Beyond all dispute, the best of the early lyric poets is Robert Herrick, whose verses are flushed with a joyous and tender spirit. He may be styled the Burns of his time, and imbued with something of the reckless soul of our own countryman. Herrick was born in Cheapside in the year 1591, and educated at Cambridge. In 1629 he became vicar of Dean Prior, in Devonshire. The time of the Civil War, however, found him living at Westminster, where he resided also



during the Commonwealth.\* After the Restoration he came into his vicarage again, but by this time he was an old man, and none the better for his devotion to the convivial company to be found in the London taverns, where he was ever one of the gayest of the gay. He died in 1674, having left behind him some of the sweetest word-music that we possess. Nothing could be more delightful than these verses on the Daffodils:—

‘ Fair Daffodils, we weep to see  
 You haste away so soon :  
 As yet the early rising sun \*  
 Has not attained his noon.  
     Stay, stay,  
 Until the hasting day  
     Has run  
 But to the even-song ;  
 And having prayed together, we  
 Will go with you along.  
 We have short time to stay, as you,  
     We have as short a spring ;  
 As quick a growth to meet decay  
     As you, or any thing.  
     We die,  
 As your hours do, and dry  
     Away  
 Like to the summer’s rain ;  
 Or as the pearls of morning dew,  
 Ne’er to be found again.’

Besides the grace that is inseparable from all Herrick’s compositions, we have here that sympathy with Nature which made good his claim to the title of poet. Flowers, music, woman, all these had their intense and several charms for him, and strangely enough for a middle-aged clergyman he was clearly an amorous and erotic poet. There is a tinge of sensuousness about all that he does, which sometimes exceeds the limits of a later age. But all his poems to Julia are singular for their beauty. Take the Night Piece addressed to her:—

‘ Her eyes the glowworm lend thee,  
 The shooting stars attend thee,  
     And the elves also,  
     Whose little eyes glow  
 Like the sparks of fire, befriend thee.  
 No Will-o’-th’-wisp mislight thee,  
 Nor snake or slow-worm bite thee ;  
     But on, on thy way,  
     Not making a stay,  
 Since ghost there’s none to affright thee.

Let not the dark thee cumber;  
 What though the moon does slumber?  
     The stars of their night,  
     Will lend thee their light  
 Like tapers clear, without number.  
 Then, Julia, let me woo thee,  
 Thus, thus to come unto me,  
     And when I shall meet  
     Thy silvery feet,  
 My soul I'll pour into thee.'

The age in which Herrick lived, and in which he wrote such verses as these, was distinguished for its poetic excellence, and its indulgence in fancy and conceit. Another writer to whom slight reference has been made, George Wither, was of the same school as Herrick, and almost his equal in tenderness and delicacy of treatment. Sir John Suckling was also a great master in the art, though he is frequently robbed of his true honours. His Ballad upon a Wedding is one of the most naturally-expressed poems in the language. How these stanzas make us realise the charming being whom he describes!—

'Her feet beneath her petticoat,  
 Like little mice, stole in and out,  
     As if they feared the light:  
 But O! she dances such a way!  
 No sun upon an Easter-day  
     Is half so fine a sight.  
 Her cheeks, so rare a white was on,  
 No daisy makes comparison;  
     Who sees them is undone;  
 For streaks of red were mingled there,  
 Such as are on a Cath'rine pear,  
     The side that's next the sun.  
 Her lips were red; and one was thin,  
 Compared to that was next her chin,  
     Some bee had stung it newly;  
 But, Dick, her eyes so guard her face,  
 I durst no more upon them gaze,  
     Than on the sun in July.'

We have now glanced sufficiently at this early poetry to apprehend its character by the aid of the examples given. Its great feature is its naturalness. All its similes and its reflections are drawn from outward objects. The close breath of cities does not seem to have tainted the souls of the poets, who revel in flowers, and woods, and meads, which are the springs of laughter, joy, and pathos to them.

We now advance a stage, arriving at the minor poets of the Restoration. While not missing a great portion of the sweetness which belonged to their earlier brethren, we find that their prevailing characteristic is sentiment, sometimes degenerating into exaggeration. The age of Charles II. being famous for its gallantry, the courtly poets fill their pages with an extravagant homage to the women of the day. Now and then the adulatory amatory poetry of Lovelace, Montrose, Rochester, and their *confrères* affects the reader as being what the Americans would describe 'high salutin', and the point of a compliment is often made absurd by its prodigious unsuitability and extravagance; but in the verse of this period there still remains the genuine ring of song. The cavalier hangs his heart upon his sleeve, and talks loudly enough about it, it is true. He is more than Cupid's follower; he is the little god's very humble slave. There is a certain lightness of touch in Lovelace's ballads that we rarely meet with elsewhere, and his lines written to Althea from prison are 'familiar in our mouths as household words.' He reaches a loftier strain when he serenely asserts in immortal lines that though immured between stone walls he is nevertheless free. Sedley, justly famous for his songs, and as justly infamous for his dissolute character, is the author of the charming lyric, 'Phillis is my 'only Joy.' Buckingham was a man of a lower order of talent than these, and yet—through the adventitious aid derived from his position at Court—his pieces spread far and wide, though nobody cares for them now. There is no power in them, though there is sometimes a facile execution. Dryden, it will be remembered, described Buckingham in the character of Zimri as one who

'In the course of one revolving moon  
Was chemist, fiddler, statesman, and buffoon.'

He wrote the fashionable verses of his time from an overweening conceit which would not suffer him to be behind his contemporaries, and never stayed to ask himself whether he possessed the necessary gifts. The Earl of Rochester had a more genuine vein; but one cannot avoid the impression that most of the singers of his time had simply a parrot-like title to fame. 'Sackville, Earl of Dorset, was stronger than any of those just named, and his stirring ballad, 'To all you Ladies 'now on Land,' written the night before an engagement with the Dutch, is as widely known as any of Dibdin's songs. In the navy debates of the House of Commons even in the present year some of its admirable lines were quoted. The effeminacy which so strongly marked the poetry of the time is

completely eliminated from this ballad, which possesses both a fine swing and epigrammatic force.

Edmund Waller, however, has left behind him a name more durable in connexion with this class of poetry than any other man of his century. It is to be hoped he was more constant in his friendships than he was in his politics. Having twanged the lyre, and beautifully too, in praise of Cromwell, he afterwards poured forth congratulatory strains for Charles II. There was no element of greatness in his composition; possessing as much sweetness as Milton, he yet was a perfect contrast to him in all other respects. Compared with the grand old blind poet, he was a rose beside an oak. There was fragrance, but no stability, and he rapidly fell to pieces. Yet even from the dried leaves of the rose, which have been preserved, we can extract pleasant odours. His imagination was not of a striking order, and his verse is more distinguished for its finish than for any other quality; indeed in this respect he has scarcely had an equal since. His 'Go, lovely Rose,' which we have already had occasion to mention, and 'Lines on a Girdle,' are the best specimens we possess of his writing, but these are matchless in their way. Had he owned a larger and more sincere nature we might have had in him a great poet.

We can hardly assign a place amongst these canary-birds to the satanic muse of Swift. He was a bird of prey in comparison with them, and threw too much of passion and hatred into the most playful of his verses to be ranked with such singers. But what force and command of language, of metre, and of rhyme! what a mastery of all he touched! We prefer for our present purpose to take him in his gentlest mood, and to transcribe a few lines to Stella, which might have been written by a man who had not betrayed another woman.

'Stella, say, what evil tongue  
Reports you are no longer young;  
That Time sits with his scythe to mow  
Where erst sat Cupid with his bow;  
That half your locks are turned to grey?  
I'll ne'er believe a word they say.  
'Tis true, but let it not be known,  
My eyes are somewhat dimmish grown:  
For Nature, always in the right,  
To your decay adapts my sight;  
And wrinkles undistinguish'd pass,  
For I'm ashamed to use a glass;  
And till I see them with these eyes,  
Whoever says you have them, lies.

No length of time can make you quit  
 Honour and virtue, sense and wit;  
 Thus you may still be young to me,  
 While I can better hear than see.  
 O ne'er may Fortune show her spite,  
 To make me deaf, and mend my sight.'

One other name amongst the earlier minor poets must arrest our attention before we come to those of the nineteenth century. In alluding to Matthew Prior, we cannot do better than quote Cowper's words upon our whole subject. 'Every man conversant with verse-making knows, and knows by painful experience, that the familiar style is of all styles the most difficult to succeed in. To make verse speak the language of prose without being prosaic, to marshal the words of it in such an order as they might naturally take in falling from the lips of an extemporary speaker, yet without meanness, harmoniously, elegantly, and without seeming to displace a syllable for the sake of the rhyme, is one of the most arduous tasks a poet can undertake. He that could accomplish this task was Prior. Many have imitated his excellence in this particular, but the best copies have fallen short of the original.' This is a generous tribute, coming as it does from one who was himself no mean adept in the same art. Cowper, though he has much sense and humour, is no match for Prior in this unpretending kind of poetry. The French are more exquisite than ourselves in drawing-room verses, and there is a decided smack of their quality in Prior. It has been remarked of him that he 'drank Burgundy in its own vineyard.' But he was a sad, rollicking dog, this author of 'Solomon,' and exactly after his patron, the Earl of Dorset's, own heart. Prior rose from the humblest rank of life to occupy a position of some importance in the state. He was born at Abbot Street, in Dorsetshire, but early removed with his father to London, who kept a tavern called the 'Rummer Inn,' at Charing Cross, and it was here in the garb of a waiter that Lord Dorset one day discovered the future poet reading Horace. Acting the part of a generous patron, Dorset sent the youth to St. John's, Cambridge, of which college he afterwards became a Fellow. After leaving the university, Prior, in conjunction with Montagu, wrote 'The Town and Country Mouse,' which opened a path for him to the diplomatic service. Promotion was only a question of time, and accordingly we find that during his somewhat chequered existence he filled the offices of Secretary at the Hague, and at the Court of Versailles, and Com-

missioner of Trade. His life was a singular mixture of noble feeling and dissoluteness. Fickle in the extreme, and an easy prey to the wiles of the other sex, he was frequently reduced to the very depths of degradation and poverty. As a writer his longer poems have not many claims to a lasting remembrance; but his shorter pieces justly deserve all the fame they have acquired. They come barely short of perfection; Prior strives hard after obtaining a classic grace and just misses it. As a specimen of the finished character of his verses we cite one of his short odes:—

‘The merchant, to secure his treasure,  
 Conveys it in a borrowed name:  
 Euphelia serves to grace my measure,  
 But Chloe is my real flame.  
 My softest verse, my darling lyre,  
 Upon Euphelia’s toilet lay—  
 When Chloe noted her desire  
 That I should sing, that I should play.  
 My lyre I tune, my voice I raise,  
 But with my numbers mix my sighs;  
 And whilst I sing Euphelia’s praise,  
 I fix my soul on Chloe’s eyes.  
 Fair Chloe blushed: Euphelia frowned:  
 I sang, and gazed; I played and trembled;  
 And Venus to the Loves around  
 Remark’d how ill we all dissembled.’

And thus the poet spent his time between his Chloes and Eupheliæ, constant to none, but writing charmingly of each. All his poetry has a devil-may-care air about it; it gives the impression that it was written by a man who found himself in a world where there was much that ministers to pleasure, and who meant to suck its sweets to the uttermost. The complete absence of consciousness that life had in it something nobler than animal pleasure deprived his poetry of the high tone which should give a flavour even to light and unpretentious verse. Whenever Bacchus and Venus are the poet’s gods we may look for enervation in his intellectual offspring. That taint of scepticism in his nature of which an eminent French critic writes—and which he declares was transferred to Voltaire, and was not of the latter’s own originating—is apparent in Prior’s lines to his soul:—

‘Poor little, pretty, fluttering thing,  
 Must we no longer live together?  
 And dost thou prune thy trembling wing,  
 To take thy flight thou know’st not whither?’

Thy humorous vein, thy pleasing folly,  
 Lie all neglected, all forgot :  
 And pensive, wavering, melancholy,  
 Thou dread'st and hop'st thou know'st not what.'

Occasionally he had a satirical touch which was very pointed if not great. If he could not stab with the rapier he could prick with the needle. He describes in one of his effusions a remedy that is worse than the disease :—

' I sent for Ratcliffe ; was so ill,  
 That other doctors gave me over :  
 He felt my pulse, prescribed his pill,  
 And I was likely to recover.  
 But when the wit began to wheeze,  
 And wine had warm'd the politician,  
 Cured yesterday of my disease,  
 I died last night of my physician.'

Mat. Prior was held in high esteem by the most competent of his contemporaries, with whom he lived on excellent terms. But the judgment upon him must be that he faithfully represented in himself the follies of his time. His verse is flexible, sparkling, and flowing ; at times, but very seldom, it merits higher praise ; yet there was no one in his own day who wrote such verse so well. His views of woman, society, life, and pleasure were those almost of the lowest stratum, though his power over his art was so great that he could frequently counterfeit sentiments of a higher order.

As we approach our own times, Winthrop Mackworth Praed may be said to enjoy the distinction of having hit upon a new vein of poetry, and of having been himself its happiest explorer. Without possessing the highest gifts of the poet, his smoothness and elegance have earned for him a reputation. It is not a little singular that his great ambition should have been to distinguish himself in a very different field from that with which his name is principally associated. We remember him as a subordinate member of Sir Robert Peel's first administration, and as an effective speaker in the House of Commons. His career was cut short by his death from consumption, at a moment when he was beginning to put forth broader and more sympathetic views than those which animated the great bulk of the Conservative party. His spirit was keen and eager, and the great incentive to all he did was the desire to excel. This passion mastered his whole being ; and the momentary earnestness he threw into every successive undertaking was probably instrumental in undermining his constitution. Praed takes us into another atmosphere altogether from that in which Swift

and Prior moved. Even satire had become good-natured and love decorous. We discover no single line which could not be read aloud in the most fastidious circle. Praed has the sweetness of a summer's night, and his wit represents the twinkling of the stars. Yet, in the midst of all his gaiety, in some of his poems a tinge of melancholy seems to indicate a premature weariness of life:—

'I think that very few have sighed  
 When Fate at last has found them,  
 Though bitter foes were by their side,  
 And barren moss around them;  
 I think that some have died of drought,  
 And some have died of drinking;  
 I think that nought is worth a thought—  
 And I'm a fool for thinking!'

But, again, he resumes in a more sprightly and hopeful tone:—

'I think that friars and their hoods,  
 Their doctrines and their maggots,  
 Have lighted up too many feuds,  
 And far too many faggots;  
 I think, while zealots fast and frown,  
 And fight for two or seven,  
 That there are fifty roads to Town,  
 And rather more to Heaven.'

The satire of Praed always conveys the impression that it is veiled. The poet is so vivacious, and so longs for all men to be blithe, that he strikes rather with the back of his sword than with its edge. There is the flash of the blade in air, but something arrests its descent—some sudden second impulse in the spirit of him who wields it. From a very early period in life Praed gave himself up to the writing of light and amusing verse, and the magazine he edited at Eton contained much that was choice and sparkling. Macaulay had already shown that these amusements were not unworthy of a man of genius, and his Valentine to Lady Mary Stanhope, written after his return from India, is a capital illustration of the style of verse written by literary men in leisure hours. The stately verse of the Whig historian, as we find it in the 'Lays of Ancient Rome,' is far in advance of any serious poetry written by Praed; but, on the other hand, the latter excelled his distinguished collaborateur in the poetry of the drawing-room. His work is all executed with a care and minuteness which are very admirable. He knew exactly the precise amount of seriousness to infuse into his lines, and we are never wearied



with too much sermonising. Could there be anything better of its kind than his portrait of 'Quince,' who stands out in bold relief, in pure flesh and blood, with his last words on bidding farewell to the world:—

' My debts are paid—but Nature's debt  
Almost escaped my recollection;  
Tom! we shall meet again, and yet  
I cannot leave you my direction!'

And with what fluency and whimsicality of expression he describes his Vicar!—

' His talk was like a stream which runs  
With rapid change from rock to roses;  
It slipped from politics to puns;  
It passed from Mahomet to Moses:  
Beginning with the laws that keep  
The planets in their radiant courses,  
And ending with some precept deep,  
For dressing eels or shoeing horses.

He did not think all mischief fair,  
Although he had a knack of joking;  
He did not make himself a bear,  
Although he had a taste for smoking:  
And when religious sects ran mad,  
He held, in spite of all his learning,  
That if a man's belief is bad,  
It will not be improved by burning.

And he was kind, and loved to sit  
In the low hut or garnished cottage,  
And praise the farmer's homely wit,  
And share the widow's homelier pottage:  
At his approach complaint grew mild,  
And when his hand unbarred the shutter,  
The clammy lips of fever smiled  
The welcome which they could not utter.

This is not poetry to move the world; there is no vehemence of passion in it, but it is true drawing in quiet lines, and more powerful than the mere form of it will suffer to appear. The emotional element was not over-developed in the author or he would sometimes have been able to give to his sketches just that complementary strength which would have made several of them great. If he has not the highest command over the pathetic, however, in a certain flow of humour he is unapproachable. A specimen of this is found in his reminiscences of the old school-days at Eton, where he describes the school

and his school-fellows. He could throw round attachments of this kind an indescribable charm. Another character entitled 'The Belle of the Ball-room,' though not so clever and clearly cut in every line, is more humorous than 'The Vicar.' Even his love verses took a semi-humorous form:—

'Our love was like most other loves;  
 A little glow, a little shiver,  
 A rose-bud, and a pair of gloves,  
 And "Fly not yet" upon the river:  
 Some jealousy of some one's heir,  
 Some hopes of dying broken-hearted,  
 A miniature, a lock of hair,  
 The usual vows—and then we parted.  
 We parted; months and years rolled by;  
 We met again four summers after:  
 Our parting was all sob and sigh;  
 Our meeting was all mirth and laughter;  
 For in my heart's most secret cell  
 There had been many other lodgers;  
 And she was not the ball-room's belle,  
 But only—Mrs. Something Rogers.'

Although Praed's more pretentious poems exhibit considerable taste and the same wonderful facility for rhyming, they are evidently not penned in his most natural vein. Not equal to the music of higher poets they pale still further, and are somewhat dull and heavy reading, when compared with stanzas such as those we have been quoting, and which have in them the sparkle and the fizz of champagne. His serious work has a reminiscence of the same flavour, but the spirit has fled. We are dealing with him only as a writer of fugitive verse, for he is one of the men who will be remembered longer for the trifles in which he succeeded than for the greater undertakings in which he failed. Racy, graphic, witty and brilliant, he was just such a poet as the society in which he moved demanded; and, as he had a decided scintillation of genius, he was able to endow his fancies with more permanence than it is usual for such verse to attain.

But Praed must not blind us to the merits of other writers contemporary with him who are in danger of passing from recollection. Peacock the novelist, author of 'Headlong Hall' and many other remarkable works, had a decided gift in verse, though he seldom made use of it. His poem of 'Love and Age' is amongst the best of its kind, and may well entitle him to mention here. Now and then his contempt for preconceived notions, and the bitterness of his soul, oozed out, as when he wrote upon the rich and poor:—

'The poor man's sins are glaring;  
 In the face of ghostly warning  
 He is caught in the fact  
 Of an overt act—  
 Buying greens on Sunday morning.

The rich man has a cellar,  
 And a ready butler by him;  
 The poor must steer  
 For his pint of beer  
 Where the Saint can't choose but spy him.

The rich man is invisible  
 In the crowd of his gay society;  
 But the poor man's delight  
 Is a sore in the sight,  
 And a stench in the nose of piety.'

Yet Peacock's nature was too caustic for a writer of light verse. A much better man in this respect was Luttrell, whose social talents were of a high order. He had not the genius of a *Praed*, but at times nevertheless showed much happiness in expression. One could scarcely imagine, for instance, a better or more perfect epigram than this on the distinguished singer, Miss Tree:—

'On this Tree, if a nightingale settles and sings,  
 The Tree will return her as good as she brings.'

Luttrell wrote a lengthy poem styled '*Advice to Julia*,' which contains many witty descriptions of life in the upper classes of society, and a most amusing description of London fog and smoke. His '*Amptill Park*' shows that he possessed no mean powers of poetical description. Of various things which he wrote may be mentioned his verses to Lady Granville, his epigram on Moore's verses being translated into Persian and sung in the streets of Ispahan, and the lines still inscribed in Rogers's arbour at Holland House. On this same arbour it will be remembered Lord Holland penned the pretty conceit—

'Here Rogers sat, and here for ever dwell,  
 To me, those "Pleasures" that he sang so well.'

One of Luttrell's efforts was a *tour de force* in rhyming on '*Burnham Beeches*.' Some of the stanzas run as follows:—

'What though my tributary lines  
 Be less like Pope's than Creech's,  
 The theme, if not the poet, shines,  
 So bright are Burnham-beeches.

O'er many a dell and upland walk,  
 Their sylvan beauty reaches ;  
 Of Birnam-wood let Scotland talk,  
 While we've our Burnham-beeches.

If sermons be in stones, I'll bet  
 Our vicar, when he preaches,  
 He'd find it easier far to get  
 A hint from Burnham-beeches.

Here bards have mused, here lovers true  
 Have dealt in softest speeches,  
 While suns declined, and, parting, threw  
 Their gold o'er Burnham-beeches.

O ne'er may woodman's axe resound,  
 Nor tempest, making breaches  
 In the sweet shade that cools the ground  
 Beneath our Burnham-beeches.

Hold ! though I'd fain be jingling on,  
 My power no further reaches—  
 Again that rhyme ! enough—I've done :  
 Farewell to Burnham-beeches.'

It would be idle to recapitulate what Moore has accomplished in the way of light lyrical verse, seeing that his songs are almost as widely known as the language itself. Other poets must be passed over who do not depend upon the lighter achievements for their fame—as Pope, Cowper, Mrs. Browning, Lord Byron, Campbell, Coleridge, Hood, Sheridan, and Rogers. Two names, nevertheless, warrant a slight pause—those of Thackeray and Walter Savage Landor. The former has bequeathed to us two or three pieces of light verse, exquisite of their kind. One is 'The Cane-bottomed Chair,' whose simple description and pathos must have touched all who have read it. Easy, natural, and flowing, it is as good as anything that Praed ever wrote, and has glimpses of endowments which he did not possess. With all his wonderful finish there was not the same width in Praed as in Thackeray ; and had he not achieved one of the highest reputations as a novelist, the latter would have gained no inconsiderable place as a singer of every-day life. Imagination was absent in him ; but humour, satire, playfulness, tenderness, were abundant. 'The Ballad of Bouillabaisse' might serve as a model of most of these qualities. Its writer shows here, as in other poems, the wonderful attachment he felt for old things, old places, and old faces. His riper genius loved to dwell on characters which were simple-hearted, and through the medium of his verse he

talks to us in a pleasanter vein than in his novels. His 'Peg of 'Linsavaddy' has been a thousand times spoken of for its light dancing music, in which it is unapproachable except by Father Prout's 'Bells of Shandon'; and it has the manifest advantage over the latter in that it possesses a human interest, whilst Prout's lines are simply musical — almost nonsensical — and nothing more. But of all Thackeray's lyrics commend us to the one 'At the Church Gate,' for simplicity, beauty, and sweetness:—

‘ Although I enter not,  
Yet round about the spot  
Ofttimes I hover !  
And near the Sacred Gate  
With longing eyes I wait,  
Expectant of her.

My lady comes at last,  
Timid, and stepping fast,  
And hastening hither  
With modest eyes downcast :  
She comes—she's here—she's past—  
May Heav'n go with her.

Kneel undisturb'd, fair Saint !  
Pour out your praise or plaint  
Meekly and duly :  
I will not enter there,  
To sully your pure prayer  
With thoughts unruly.

But suffer me to pace  
Round the forbidden place,  
Lingering a minute,  
Like outcast spirits who wait  
And see through Heaven's gate  
Angels within it.'

In a somewhat similar vein of refined feeling with a genuine classical grace Walter Savage Landor wrote:—

‘ The maid I love ne'er thought of me  
Amid the scenes of gaiety ;  
But when her heart or mine sank low,  
Ah, then it was no longer so.

From the slant palm she raised her head,  
And kissed the cheek whence youth had fled.  
Angels ! some future day for this,  
Give her as sweet and pure a kiss.'

There is something glowing, soft, and oriental about

Landor's genius. He stands alone in his gifts as clearly as any poet. Some of his minor works are worthy of a place in the Greek anthology.

Lord Houghton is another poet who has translated into graceful verse the impressions gained from society; but he possesses a stronger and a fresher air than belong to the poets of society generally. Music and thought are what he gives us rather than point and dashing description. In his quiet strains we come sometimes upon reflections of considerable depth, and the shadow of the literary devotee always falls athwart his pages. We like his utter freedom from artificiality; his range of poetic powers is not of the highest order, but there is scarcely a poet who could be named who has done so uniformly well in all themes selected for treatment. Those who attach no merit to dealing with ordinary and every-day subjects, might attempt to detract from Lord Houghton's praise by affirming that he too often recurs to such topics; but it ought to be recognised fully by this time that it requires no ordinary gift to treat of homely things in a successful manner. And he has the especial merit of looking beneath the surface of things and touching the springs of life and thought which are in his heart.

‘ A sense of an earnest will,  
To help the lowly living,  
And a terrible heart-thrill  
If you have no power of giving :  
An arm of aid to the weak,  
A friendly hand to the friendless,  
Kind words, so short to speak,  
But whose echo is endless.’

Every one is acquainted with the song ‘ I wandered by the ‘ Brook Side,’ which is a happy specimen of the minor lyric; but many others could be cited of equal value, including the pretty pastoral verses commencing ‘ When long upon the ‘ scales of Fate.’

Amongst the best living writers of this kind of verse must indisputably be placed Mr. Frederick Locker; and for this reason it will be well to give his work a somewhat closer inspection. There are two distinct sides to his talent, both of which find adequate representation in his ‘ London Lyrics.’ In a note appended to these lyrics, which is one of the smartest pieces of writing in the volume, the author has given a faithful summary of the requirements of that branch of the poetic art to which he is devoted. He says—and his words will help to find the clue for understanding his own claims

upon us—‘Light lyrical verse should be short, elegant, refined, and fanciful, not seldom distinguished by chastened sentiment, and often playful. The tone should not be pitched high, and it should be idiomatic, the rhythm crisp and sparkling, the rhyme frequent and never forced, while the entire poem should be marked by tasteful moderation, high finish, and completeness; for however trivial the subject matter may be, indeed rather in proportion to its triviality, subordination to the rules of composition, and perfection of execution should be strictly enforced. Each piece cannot be expected to exhibit all these characteristics, but the qualities of brevity and buoyancy are essential.’ But he concludes these remarks by a confession that his volume may contain a few pieces which ‘ought to have been consigned to the dust-bin of immediate oblivion.’ That is possible; we cannot commend all alike. The writer of these trifles is in constant danger of falling into triviality or childishness. But if he amuses us we are not disposed to put butterflies on the rack, or to ask of him more than he aspires to give. Mr. Locker is not quite so elegant, perhaps, as his forerunner Præd; he is more sprightly and humorous. Liveliness, and what we should call the humour of surprise, are two of his distinguishing features. These qualities shine in the verses entitled ‘Episode in the Story of a Muff.’ The reader is kept on the tiptoe of expectation till the very last line, and the revulsion of feeling then experienced is due to a very unexpected stroke of drollery.

‘She’s jealous! Am I sorry? No!

I like to see my Mabel so,

*Carina mia!*

Poor Puss! That now and then she draws

Conclusions, not without a cause,

Is my idea.

We love; and I’m prepared to prove

That jealousy is kin to love

In constant women.

My jealous Pussy cut up rough

The day before I bought her muff

With sable trimming.

These tearful darlings think to quell us

By being so divinely jealous;

But I know better.

Hillo! Who’s that? A damsel! come,

I’ll follow; no, I can’t, for some

One else has met her.

What fun ! He looks a lad of grace !  
 She holds her muff to hide her face ;  
     They kiss,—the sly Puss !  
 Hillo ! Her muff—it's trimmed with sable !  
 It's like the muff I gave to Mabel ! . . .  
     *Good lord, she's MY Puss !* ' .

A similar surprise, though not of so humorous a nature, follows the reading of 'The Old Cradle,' which is amongst the lyrics that have deservedly become general favourites. Mr. Locker sees the emptiness of life, and pursues like every poet the unattainable ideal, and yet is able to extract a modicum of enjoyment in the pursuit. The knowledge that things 'are not (exactly) what they seem' is not to be suffered to make him miserable. It cannot, for instance, stop his song—

'If life an empty bubble be,  
 How sad for those who cannot see  
     The rainbow in the bubble !'

Whatever may be the case with society in the nineteenth century, or a large portion of it, at any rate there is no *blasé* air in Mr. Locker's verses. To read them makes one cheerful, and causes us to lose the sensation of selfishness and isolation which the individual course of life is apt to create. To write with ease and simplicity strains which shall touch the peasant and the peer is no small achievement, and when the poet attains to that he needs no other *raison d'être*. Some writers have not that airy quicksilver spirit which catches momentary impressions of grace and beauty; they are too cold and too severe, and hence their works are not adapted to any mood or any person. The true writer of occasional verse has the advantage of his stronger intellectual brother in this respect. He never comes amiss; his music is ever welcome and refreshing. We do not require him to fill us with awe, to dilate on the grandeur of nature, and to discuss the great problems of life and mind. We ask him to speak to us as a brother, to laugh with us as in the family circle, and, if need be, to mourn with us as a friend. But this poet of society does not always sing with the cap and bells on. Now and then, though very seldom, he must draw from the fount of tears. He will do it tenderly, but it must be done, for life is not made up entirely of either the grave or the gay. He knows that every man has his 'skeleton in the cupboard,' and there is nothing to be gained in blinking the fact. Having, therefore, an unpleasant subject to encounter, but also a most pressing one, this is how he must deal with it:—



‘ We hug this phantom we detest,  
 We rarely let it cross our portals :  
 It is a most exacting guest—  
 Now, are we not afflicted mortals ?

• Your neighbour Gay, that jovial wight,  
 As Dives rich, and brave as Hector—  
 Poor Gay steals twenty times a night,  
 On shaking knees, to see his spectre.

Al! me, the World ! How fast it spins !  
 The beldames dance, the caldron bubbles ;  
 They shriek, and stir it for our sins,  
 And we must drain it for our troubles.

We toil, we groan ; the cry for love  
 Mounts upwards from the seething city,  
 And yet I know we have above  
 A Father, infinite in pity.’

And thus our poet, in his quiet and unobtrusive manner, becomes a moral teacher. The verses we have just quoted are from Mr. Locker's serious poems, and may serve to correct a very prevalent but erroneous notion respecting his poetry. He has acquired so conspicuous a position as a writer of *vers de société* that people are in the habit of speaking of him as though he never wrote anything else. True, if the scope of this class of verse be vastly widened, and in the manner we have indicated, all he has written would come under the definition. But if the narrow, restricted meaning be taken, then there is a side of Mr. Locker's work which has been completely misapprehended. He manifests a vein of much richer quality than is ever witnessed in mere fugitive verse. Thus in ‘ The Widow's Mite ’ there is a vein of genuine pathos :—

‘ A widow—she had only one !  
 A puny and decrepit son ;  
 But, day and night,  
 Though fretful oft, and weak and small,  
 A loving child, he was her all—  
 The Widow's Mite.

The Widow's Mite—ay, so sustain'd,  
 She battled onward, nor complain'd  
 Though friends were fewer :  
 And while she toil'd for daily fare  
 A little crutch upon the stair  
 Was music to her.

I saw her then,—and now I see  
 That, though resign'd and cheerful, she  
 Has sorrowed much :  
 She has, He gave it tenderly,  
 Much faith ; and carefully laid by,  
 A little crutch.'

One other copy of verses we must quote from Mr. Locker before quitting this portion of his writings. 'The unrealized 'Ideal' seems to us not only to be full of a sweet naturalness, but to catch the very echo of regret. It is not unworthy of Schiller or of Heine :—

'My only love is always near,—  
 In country or in town  
 I see her twinkling feet, I hear  
 The whisper of her gown.  
 She foots it ever fair and young,  
 Her locks are tied in haste,  
 And one is o'er her shoulder flung,  
 And hangs below her waist.  
 She ran before me in the meads ;  
 And down this world-worn track  
 She leads me on ; but while she leads  
 She never gazes back.  
 And yet her voice is in my dreams,  
 To witch me more and more ;  
 That wooing voice ! Ah me, it seems  
 Less near me than of yore.  
 Lightly I sped when hope was high,  
 And youth beguil'd the chase,—  
 I follow, follow still ; but I  
 Shall never see her face.'

There is not much visible sign of deterioration in the public taste when these and similar true and melodious strains remain popular. In other respects Mr. Locker has one of the best gifts which the writer of this class of verse ought to possess, viz. spontaneity. We do not remember any of his pieces which it was in the least tedious to read. It does not follow, however, that verses which have apparently so spontaneous an air have been written with ease ; on the contrary, they are often produced with the greatest care, and very seldom given forth to the world till they have undergone a long process of elaboration and finish. The most exquisite lyrics of the Poet Laureate, those which from their sweet flow and naturalness

seem to have been most readily composed, are really the productions of intense and constant effort.

In a more sprightly vein Mr. Locker sings :—

‘The world’s a sorry wench, akin  
 To all that’s frail and frightful :  
 The world’s as ugly, ay, as Sin—  
 And almost as delightful !  
 The world’s a merry world (*pro tem.*)  
 And some are gay, and therefore  
 It pleases them, but some condemn  
 The world they do not care for.  
 The world’s an ugly world. Offend  
 Good people, how they wrangle !  
 The manners that they never mend,  
 The characters they mangle !  
 They eat, and drink, and scheme, and plod,  
 And go to church on Sunday ;  
 And many are afraid of God—  
 And more of Mrs. Grundy.’

Mr. Locker’s talent is in harmony with the spirit of the time. He lives so in the age and belongs so much to what is best in its society that he may fairly be remembered and quoted hereafter as a representative of it. His earnestness and sincerity are very marked characteristics, and the genuineness of his song will provide against its extinction. His fancy is chaste and selective, his wit delicate, his style polished and graceful, and it is possible that some of his light fabrics may outlive more stately and solid edifices.

A word remains to be said of other living writers of this class, but there is little that merits a lengthened detention. Just as a passing reference must suffice for second-rate writers in generations which have recently expired—Haynes Bayly, the Hon. W. R. Spencer, Maginn, and others—so must a few sentences suffice for their successors.. Yet, as we pass them by, we must reserve a place for the touching songs of Mrs. Arkwright, whose exquisite voice still vibrates in our ears, whilst some couplets of her composition linger in our memory. The following lines of hers may be new to many readers :—

‘I used to love the Winter cold,  
 And when my daily task was done  
 To roll the snowy ball, and hold  
 My crystal daggers in the sun.  
 How beautiful, how bright !  
 How soon they melt away,  
 Till drop by drop they vanish quite—  
 Ah ! well a day !

And then the Spring, the smiling Spring,  
 The flowers, the fruit, the murmuring rill !  
 To chase the shadows o'er the hill  
 And dance within the fairy ring.  
 Ye flowers so bright and gay  
 Within the garden wall,  
 Ye'll meet again all smiling, all—  
 Ah ! well a day !

Untir'd the Summer's heat to bear,  
 Beneath the flow'ry load to bend,  
 The mimic banquet to prepare,  
 And share it with some joyous friend !  
 How soon the day is done—  
 The longest summer day !  
 'Tis morn—'tis noon—'tis set of sun—  
 Ah ! well a day !

The most promising of the younger writers of minor verse is Mr. Austin Dobson, whose 'Vignettes in Rhyme' betoken considerable poetic fancy, though his wit is far inferior to that of Mr. Locker. The following lines, which are a fair example of Mr. Dobson's style, are taken from his poem suggested by a chapter in Mr. Theodore Martin's 'Horace':—

"HORATIUS FLACCUS, B.C. 8,"  
 There's not a doubt about the date,—  
 You're dead and buried :  
 As you remarked, the seasons roll ;  
 And 'cross the Styx full many a soul  
 Has Charon ferried,  
 Since, mourned of men and Muses nine,  
 They laid you on the Esquiline.

Ours is so far-advanced an age !  
 Sensation tales, a classic stage,  
 Commodious villas !  
 We boast high art, an Albert Hall,  
 Australian meat, and men who call  
 Their sires gorillas !  
 We have a thousand things, you see,  
 Not dreamt in your philosophy.

Science proceeds, and man stands still ;  
 Our " world " to-day's as good or ill,—  
 As cultured (nearly),  
 As yours was, Horace ! You alone,  
 Unmatched, unmet, we have not known.

The author of the 'Carols of Cockayne' is deserving of men-

tion for his humour and observation; but the writer of 'The 'Bab Ballads' scarcely comes under our category; his effusions partake too much of the character of broad farce. Mr. Calverley, again, whose parodies are very close and very clever, belongs to that school whose best exponents were James and Horace Smith, the incomparable authors of 'Rejected Addresses.' Mr. Mortimer Collins is a much nearer approach to what we require, but he has by no means done such good work as was expected of him. Lord Lytton's 'Fables in Song' deserve to occupy a higher rank in poetry than such lyrics as form the subject of this article. They are full of thought—sometimes overburdened with it; but they have a graceful facility of versification which entitles their author to rank with the most cultivated poets of the day.

The question may be asked, of what use is this Horatian poetry? but we apprehend it will be its own justification in the eyes of most lovers of the poetic art. The brooklet is not so imposing as the mighty river to which it is tributary, but its music may be as sweet and true. Men cannot always be climbing the magnificent passes of the Alps, but in the absence of sublime scenery does not the trimly-cut and ordered garden present many points of attraction? Thus, all singers have their proper seasons and uses. The minor poets unquestionably flourish best in seasons of national prosperity, not in those of stirring events. They are satisfied with what the world has to offer them, though in the best of them there is a strain of genuine regret, testifying that this is not sufficient to satisfy the cravings of the soul. In all the excellent writers of Venustian verse whom we have named may be perceived the shade of melancholy, which lends an additional charm to their gaiety. With the deeper questions of the heart they very rarely intermeddle. If they can touch the springs of laughter and emotion in others they receive their reward. These poets, however, have yet something to learn: England has its Shakspeare but not its Horace. To write Horatian verse successfully requires all the earnestness and devotion which the greater poet exhibits in another field. But even these trifles are not without their use and their charm, for they may be accepted by posterity as a faithful commentary upon contemporaneous events, life, and manners. Who knows but that through their aid in some distant era the stranger in our deserted gates may obtain some glimpses of our nineteenth-century civilisation; just as we now, with Horace or Martial for our friend and guide, may walk through the streets and converse with the denizens of ancient Rome?

ART. IV.—1. *Statistique de la France. Résultats généraux du Dénombrement de 1872.* Imprimerie Nationale. Paris: 1874.

2. *Récensement de la Population de la France en 1872.* Par M. RAUDOT, Député de l'Yonne. Paris: 1874.

THE Census of France is taken every five years, and not, like that of the United Kingdom, at decennial periods. But on the last occasion the war and the disturbances which followed it interrupted the ordinary course of these inquiries, and an interval of six years elapsed between the census of 1866 and the census of 1872. It will be in the recollection of our readers that we have more than once adverted to former returns of the same nature, and endeavoured to draw from their instructive pages some general inferences as to the social and political state of France. Those inferences were not of a favourable character; for it was contrary to all experience and calculation that an industrious nation inhabiting a very fertile and by no means over-peopled country should increase in numbers more slowly than any other people in Europe; that the annual draft of military conscription should be so large as sensibly to affect the natural proportion of marriages and births; and while the rural population in many departments was not increasing, but rather diminishing, that a stream of emigration should still be flowing from the rural districts to the large towns, whose population is steadily increasing at the expense of the country. These facts appeared to us, and to the French writers by whom they were carefully examined and fairly discussed, to indicate the existence of a vicious and unwholesome state of society; and subsequent accounts have proved that these judgments were not exaggerated.

It is well known that the thrift and slow increase of the French people were long upheld by economists of the Malthusian school, and especially by Mr. John Stuart Mill, as an example highly conducive to the happiness, welfare, and, we suppose, to the morality of mankind. The time is not very distant when over-population was the bugbear of economists and statesmen, to be resisted by any means and at any cost; and no doubt, *all things remaining the same* while population increases, the fears of Mr. Malthus would not be vain. But things do not remain the same. The improvement of agriculture, the application of capital and machinery even to a small territory, have demonstrated the possibility of maintaining a vast increase of population upon it; at a certain level, emigration to

new lands carries off a large portion of the surplus ; and the truth seems to be that hardly any limit can be assigned to the beneficial increase of population as long as the productive resources of the country increase in the same ratio. On the other hand, it may be inferred that where population decreases on a fertile soil, the productive resources of the country (which comprise all the elements of its prosperity and power) are not in growth. Nobody who knows anything of the natural resources of France can doubt that the territory of that country could, with great advantage, support a far larger population. The state of agriculture is still extremely backward. The subdivision of landed property among peasants of scanty capital is adverse to high farming ; and the disposition of the rural population is rather to seek to render their existing circumstances tolerable than to improve them.

But if these considerations suggest themselves to the mind on a general survey of the condition of France, the census now before us, which was taken in 1872, has very peculiar claims on our notice. It presents to us, in the irrefragable shape of arithmetic, the effects upon the population of the great convulsion through which the French nation passed between the years 1866 and 1872. It shows the actual cost in human life of those deplorable scenes of foreign and of civil war ; and it demonstrates that the effect of these calamities in checking the natural progress of population is even greater and more disastrous than the waste of life caused by war and exceptional disease. These facts are indeed of a most extraordinary character ; and although figures and statistics are not usually attractive to the reader, we think we can promise those who will take the trouble to accompany us through a succinct *résumé* of these returns, that they will learn some facts which will surprise them. We borrow them from the official record published by the Minister of the Interior, and we shall avail ourselves of the labours of M. Randot to complete our analysis. We have had occasion to quote this gentleman once or twice before. He is an upright and patriotic member of the Assembly, who has had the courage to point out for the last twenty years to what ends the legislation and the excesses of the French revolution are gradually bringing the country ; though, like Cassandra, nobody chooses to listen to or believe him.

The total population of France at the time of the census of 1866 was 38,192,064, including the forces by sea and land at home and abroad ; in 1872, it had fallen to 36,102,921, the diminution being 2,089,143. It appears however, from the

returns that the population of the districts of Alsace and Lorraine ceded to the German Empire was 1,597,238; so that the actual decrease in the population of the territory of France is 491,905—or, as we may say in round numbers, *half a million of men in six years*, or 1·29 per cent. of the whole people.\* If the population had gone on to increase in the ratio of the preceding period between the census of 1861 and 1866, which was 130,650 per annum, the total augmentation in six years would have been 816,900. The difference between what might have been, even at that low rate of progress, and what is, amounts to nearly 1,300,000 lives. These figures are taken from the official returns; those quoted by M. Raudot are rather lower. But even this statement does not include the whole of the case. This estimate includes 126,243 Alsations who gave their option to remain French, and also 740,668 foreigners residing in France.

We may here observe in passing that the number of foreigners in France has increased by 85,000 since 1866, in spite of a notable diminution of 62,000 Germans formerly settled in France, but who have now left it. The Spaniards have increased by 20,000, in consequence of the disturbed state of their own country. The Belgian emigrants amount to no less than 347,000, the English in France to 26,000, and of these three-fifths are females, owing probably to the number of Englishwomen sent to France for their education.

The fact of the large decrease of the general population of France in these six years is confirmed by M. Raudot from collateral evidence. Thus he shows that between 1867 and 1871 the number of deaths was 5,075,397, the number of births 4,704,817, the difference being 368,580.

It is natural to suppose that this enormous and unprecedented decline in the population of a great nation which has taken place whilst other nations of an equal or even inferior number of inhabitants are increasing at the rate of about 250,000 a year, is mainly attributable to the loss of life caused by war and revolution. But this inference must not be hastily adopted, more especially for two reasons.

In the first place, the decrease of population is by no means

---

\* It is probable (though there are no means of ascertaining the fact) that in the last years of the Second Empire, from 1867 to 1870, the population continued to increase slowly in the same proportion as in the preceding quinquennial period. If that was so, it only renders the fall and the decline of the subsequent years more astonishing and rapid.



confined to those departments or provinces of France which suffered most by the war. In fact it is general; there are only thirteen departments out of eighty-six in which any increase took place—the Allier, Aveyron, Bouches-du-Rhône (Marseilles), Creuse, Gironde (Bordeaux), Loire, Loire-Inférieure, Marne, Nord, Pas de Calais, Pyrénées Orientales (Spanish immigration), Seine (Paris). In the capital the augmentation was 55,436; and it will be remarked that most of these departments contain large towns which draw the rural population to them from the country. This is especially the case with Paris, where no doubt the loss of life from the siege and the war of the Commune was very large; but the deficit was promptly supplied from other quarters. The Nord, the Marne, the Loire, and the Seine were all departments devastated by war and occupied by the enemy; yet in them some increase has taken place. Throughout the remaining seventy-three departments the reverse is the case—there is an all but universal decline. Strange to say, the departments in which this decline is most strongly marked are some of the most prosperous of the agricultural provinces of France, and inhabited by the most vigorous population. Thus the department of the Manche loses 29,261, or 5·17 of its population; the Eure loses 16,683, or 4·24; the Orne, 16,733, or 4·03; Calvados loses 21,240, or 4·48. These are the richest departments of Normandy, which were but slightly affected by the war or by other untoward circumstances. The Haute-Saône (Burgundy) loses 14,426, or 4·56 of its inhabitants; the Dordogne, 22,508, or 4·49; the Sarthe, 17,081, or 3·69. These are all departments of remarkable fertility, containing few large towns, and they were not the scene of important military operations. Thirty departments were invaded by the German armies; fifty-six were not. But of these fifty-six departments forty-four have lost a population of 319,841, whilst twelve have gained 41,623—balance of loss in the non-invaded departments 268,218 souls. These departments have therefore lost at least as many of their inhabitants as those which were invaded or revolutionised.

But, in the second place, it is worthy of remark that the progressive decline here indicated is not confined to the male sex, which is chiefly, if not solely, exposed to the perils of war. In 1866, it was shown by the census of that year that the excess of the female over the male population (a fact which, as is well known, is constant in all countries) was 37,244, or about 1 per cent. In 1872, it proved that the excess of females over males was 137,899. Females had decreased from

18,253,550 in 1866 to 18,120,410—difference 133,140; males had decreased from 18,216,306 in 1866 to 17,982,541 in 1872—difference 233,795. Hence it appears that the loss of life in the male sex has exceeded the loss of life in the female sex, in these six years, by about 100,000. That figure may be taken as an approximation to an estimate of the number of men who perished by war, or by causes from which women are exempt; but, as will be observed, it accounts for a mere fraction of the deficiency. The conclusion, therefore, is that the late war cannot be regarded as the direct cause of the great decline of the population. But it is not the less certain that the war operated, from indirect as well as direct causes, a frightful destruction of life.

The average number of deaths in France from 1861 to 1866 was 865,513 per annum. In the last six months of 1870 (the war began in July), it rose to 545,666, and in the first six months of 1871 to 764,013—total in the twelve months from July 1870 to July 1871, 1,309,679, or 444,166 above the average of former years. It must, however, be added that the mortality of France in 1868 and 1869 and the first six months of 1870 was somewhat above the average, and apparently tended to increase. The actual loss of life by the war and the Commune was unquestionably large. We ourselves have heard M. Thiers say, ‘*En entrant à Paris nous avons enterré 20,000 cadavres.*’

At the same time, a notable decrease occurred in the number of births. The average number of births in France for many years had been somewhat in excess of a million, though strangely enough, before the fall of the Empire, in 1868, 1869, and 1870, it fell to about 950,000. But in 1871 it fell at once to 821,121, or nearly 200,000 below the maximum of prosperous years. In those dark and dreadful months which marked the close of 1870 and the commencement of 1871, men and women were not married or given in marriage; and the population was checked, not only by the destruction of adult life on the field of battle or the barricades of Paris, but at its source.

If we were engaged in a comparison of the population of France with that of the United Kingdom or of Germany, it would be necessary to take into account the prodigious emigration from these countries, which contributes to lessen the inconvenience of a too rapid increase of population, and adjusts the balance between the consumers and the producers of a country. In Germany, especially, the dread and hatred of universal military service, which has largely increased since

Prussia has engaged in foreign wars for the promotion of her political objects, and has acquired the supreme command of all the German armies, have stimulated emigration to an alarming extent, and the German Government has adopted the most rigorous measures (though in vain) to prevent the escape of those of its subjects who have not fulfilled the obligations of military service.

But in France the question of emigration does not arise. The French of the present century have entirely lost that spirit of adventure which once explored and peopled Lower Canada and the mouths of the Mississippi with a vigorous and enduring race, held several of the finest sugar islands, and disputed the British power in India. The true spirit of colonial enterprise expired in France with the old Monarchy, and indeed had been declining throughout the eighteenth century. Algeria, as a colony, has been a most costly and abortive experiment; after forty-four years of occupation, there are only 130,000 French settlers or inhabitants in the whole country. For, says M. Raudot, 'except on certain points there is no excess of population in France. Indeed, in many districts, the inhabitants are insufficient, because wanting hands, intelligence, and capital, the badly cultivated soil yields no adequate produce. It is France herself which, in many parts of her territory, requires to be colonised.' It may here be added from the returns that in 1866 the proportion of the population of France to the territory was 70·10 to the square kilomètre; but in 1872, in consequence of the loss of the populous districts of Alsace and Lorraine, and the general decrease we have pointed out, it had fallen to 68·30 the square kilomètre.

The only form of emigration which takes place in France is the constant flow of the rural population to the towns and cities, and this goes on regularly enough. It explains to a certain extent the decrease of the former and the increase of the latter. Thirty years ago the rural population stood to the urban population in a proportion of three-quarters to one-quarter; it now stands in the proportion of two-thirds to one-third—a very marked change to have taken place in so short a period.

The returns of this census furnish us with another curious statement as to the numbers of each family or household, including, we presume, both children and servants. The average number of persons in a French family is only 3·71; but this varies exceedingly in different parts of the country, and varies in an inverse ratio to their prosperity, intelligence, and, we must add, irreligion. Thus the department of Finisterre is at

the head of the list, with its Celtic, Catholic, and poverty-stricken population; next come the Côtes du Nord, the Landes, Morbihan, La Creuse, Savoy, and Cantal, with families of 5 or 4·50 members. They are the poorest departments of France. The wealthy departments of the centre and the south come down to 3·50; and the metropolitan département of the Seine ends the list with 2·71. The advocates and partisans of limited population point to this fact in support of their theory that poverty and an excess of population go together, and, that the one contributes to perpetuate the other. But, as we have seen, there is no excess of population in France; there is, on the contrary, a deficiency, and any local redundancy can easily find employment elsewhere. We think, therefore, that poor Finisterre renders a greater service to the nation of which it forms a humble part, by increasing the number of families and the numbers of each family, than the large cities which attract and devour the population of the land.

A few more not unimportant or uninteresting facts may here be added. It appears from the educational return of this census that thirty-hundredths, or nearly one-third, of the population of France are totally destitute of education—that is, they can neither read nor write. But this statement is in truth too favourable, for it is based on the general average of instruction throughout the country. In the eastern departments which abut on Germany and Switzerland, the rate of instruction is creditably high; thus in Franche-Comté (Doubs) only 7 per cent. of the population are uneducated; in French Lorraine (Meurthe), 8; in the Jura, 9; in the Vosges, 10; in the capital (Seine), 11. But as we recede from the German frontier into central and western France, the amount of ignorance becomes amazing. Even in Berry (Cher), it is 57 per cent.; in the highly democratic department of the Allier 52 per cent.; in Catholic Brittany (Vendée, Morbihan, and Finisterre), from 50 to 56 per cent.; on the frontier of Spain (Ariège), 53 per cent.; and in the Limousin (Haute-Vienne) 61·8 per cent. Thus there are many parts of France in which more than half the population are wholly untaught, and some in which nearly two-thirds are in this state. These facts are of deadly import to the power and resources of a country, and especially a country in which universal suffrage by the votes of these totally uneducated citizens has been made the basis of political government. In truth this circumstance alone suffices to explain the vice, the weakness, and the deception of a structure—whether it be an Empire or a Republic—based on such a foundation, and it places France at an enormous disad-

vantage in a contest with 'the most highly educated people of Europe. Lord Brougham said, nearly half a century ago, 'The schoolmaster is abroad;' but in this our day the schoolmaster is in arms. It is curious to contrast with this amount of dense ignorance the very large numbers of the clerical population of France. She has no less than 52,148 of the secular clergy, 13,102 brethren or monks of the regular orders, and 84,300 sisters and nuns, in all nearly 150,000 persons who have taken holy orders or vows. The regulars include, of course, the brothers of the Christian doctrine and the Sisters of Charity. The clerical strength of France is therefore nearly one half of her entire military strength; but we cannot congratulate the Church militant on the results of its warfare against ignorance and superstition. The number of Protestants in France has been materially diminished by the loss of Alsace; they now amount to only 580,000.

It appears that 52 per cent. of the whole population of France live by agriculture; 24 per cent. are artisans; 8 per cent. live by trade. But we learn (which surprises us) that 6 per cent., or more than two millions of Frenchmen, including their families and servants, live exclusively on their incomes, without any profession or calling at all. In this number are included no less than 55,571 *concierges*, or door porters of large houses.

We might pursue these details a good deal further, for, in point of minuteness of execution, this census of France is far more complete than our own. Thus we learn that France, in 1872, had 2,882,851 horses, with half a million of asses, and 300,000 mules; about eleven millions of oxen, twenty-five millions of sheep, five millions of pigs, two millions and a quarter of dogs, fifty-eight million fowls, and 2,389,543 *hives of bees*—further in enumeration it is hardly possible to go.

Our object, however, has been merely to lay these facts succinctly before our readers, because they appear to us to be very curious and instructive. A very long sermon might be preached on such a text; for the census certainly furnishes us with the safest possible evidence, both positive and relative, as to the true state of the nation. We shall confine ourselves to a few remarks on the probable causes and effects of these ascertained facts. It cannot be doubted that the war of 1870, and the convulsions and general insecurity which have followed it, did produce a very marked and unfavourable effect on the population of France by the actual loss of life, and still more by checking marriages and births. But this exceptional fact would not suffice to explain so large a result. There are

other social causes at work, which lead to the extraordinary conclusion that of the seventeen principal states of Europe France is that in which population increases most slowly, and in which there is the lowest proportion of births. The population of the United Kingdom and of Prussia, at its present rate of increase, doubles itself in 55 years, that of France in 183. We take it as proved that in the bulk of the population of France there exist a strong desire to limit the number of children born to each marriage, and a great indifference to the advantages of education. Both these tendencies may be traced to the extreme subdivision of property by the operation of fixed laws of succession. The French peasant is passionately attached to his nook of land, and willingly devotes his entire life, with inconceivable industry, to the cultivation of it. But the law subdivides it at his death; if his family be numerous, the fractions are minute, or rather the land must be sold and the produce divided. The hereditary principle of the transmission of property is deeply rooted in the heart of man, but the democratic principle of compulsory subdivision is opposed to it. The only mode of gratifying the one without violating the other is to limit the family. One son goes into the church to escape conscription and marriage, another into the army; one hundred and fifty thousand persons have taken vows of celibacy; and everything tends to check the multiplication of those who are to divide the cake. The non-landed proletariat, who live by wages, migrate from the rural districts to the towns, where the proportion of marriages is remarkably small; and the land, or at least a considerable portion of it, remains in the hands of the small proprietor, whose sole object in life is to keep and cultivate what belongs to him. His wants are bounded by a narrow scope. To him education is worthless, and improvements hateful. Democracy, which produces in towns and cities so many elements of disorder and instability, subsides, in a purely rural community, into stagnation and a very low level of human existence. It is opposed to enterprise and jealous of superiority; a country in which these elements preponderate would inevitably fall behind in the competition of the world and the struggle for existence, which affects nations and races of men as powerfully as it affects the growth or variety of species of animals and plants. That these causes are inherent in the laws which regulate property in France, and especially in the tenure of land, appears to us to be demonstrated by the fact that they operate with greater intensity in the richer agricultural departments than in the poorer ones.

As to the effects of these changes, we cannot for a moment admit that a country of boundless fertility and resources, which alone in Europe presents the phenomenon of a decline in the population combined with a very low standard of public instruction, is in a healthy or progressive condition. The laws or social circumstances, whatever they be, which tend to this result, must be bad laws. They may in some cases tend to improve the condition of the individual. It is not disputed that the average duration of life in France is high, and is increasing, though not as yet by the introduction of any extensive system of sanitary measures. The people are far better fed than they were in the last century, and a considerable accumulation of wealth is going on, due rather to the extreme frugality of the people than to their energy. But these facts do not compensate for the collective loss of a scanty population. The want of hands may cause a rise of wages to the advantage of those who receive them; but it not the less certainly occasions a loss to the community by the diminution and increased cost of productive power. The same reasoning applies to the elements of military strength. The system of modern armies on the Continent is a tremendous and permanent drain on the population. There are in France at present but 2,800,739 men between the ages of twenty and thirty; if the army be rated at 400,000 men, every seventh man in the country (or 14 per cent.) between these ages must be serving in it, and in the event of war the proportion would be doubled. These hateful military institutions carry off a seventh of the youthful adult population from their homes—that is, from productive industry and from domestic life—exactly at the period of life when they are most useful. The picture is a gloomy one, for the efforts made to arm and strengthen the country against its foreign enemies tend, by a vicious circle, to weaken it internally by the diminution of its population and productive resources; and it is possible that the latent causes indicated by the returns of this census may be more deeply and permanently injurious to the strength and welfare of a nation than the cost of unsuccessful war and the horrors of invasion.

- ART. V.—1. *On the Re-discovery of Biela's Comet.* By M. KLINKERFLUES. 'Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society.' London: 1873.
2. *Alcuni risultate preliminari tratte dalle osservazioni di Stelli caduti.* By G. V. SCHIAPARELLI. Milan: 1870.
3. *The Fuel of the Sun.* By W. MATTIEU WILLIAMS, F.C.S. London: 1870.
4. *Account of Donati's Comet of 1858.* By G. BOND. Cambridge, United States: 1858.
5. *The Comets; a Descriptive Treatise.* By J. R. HIND. London: 1852.
6. *Cometographie.* By A. W. PINGRE. Paris: 1783.

THE large comet of the present year, which so graciously displayed itself among the other out-of-door illuminations at the garden fête of the Royal Botanical Society on July 8, most strikingly and admirably illustrated the marvellous impetuosity with which these luminaries sweep round the sun, when they make what is termed their Perihelion Passage of near approach. This comet was first seen in the telescopes of the Marseilles Observatory, by Coggia, in the middle of April; and at that time had the aspect of an inconspicuous cloudy speck, barely perceptible upon the midnight sky. It then came rushing in through the deep empyrean that lies towards the stars of the Camelopard, until by the middle of June it loomed into the range of unassisted vision, with about the light of one of the faintest of those stars. By the end of the first week in July it was a bright object, with a brilliant tail, even in the strong summer twilight, one third of the way up above the northern horizon, but settling down rapidly towards it, and into the sunset glare. In another eight days it had plunged into the solar blaze, leaving its tail only streaming up into sight towards the stars of the Great Bear, and was hastening on towards its vanishing point in the southern constellation of the Chameleon, where it was to disappear from human observation some time in the month of September. It was quite possible for even an unastronomical observer to follow the flight of this beautiful visitant, and apprehend the technical method of its movements, as it thus came in at a rush from the starry spaces of the north, swept widely and grandly down in its broad curve between the earth and the sun, and was lost in the far south as it shot out again into the immensity there. As the comet made this brilliant descent through the



twilight of the summer sky, it moved with ever-increasing impetuosity towards its final plunge into the glare of the horizon. In twenty days from June 25 it drifted through twenty-five degrees of the sky, and in the next ten days it accomplished an arc of fifty degrees; that is, a span of the heavens as wide again. On one clear night in the middle of July it was blazing bright and high in the north-western twilight. Three or four cloudy nights followed, and held the comet concealed in their screens of mist, and when these clouds were withdrawn from the sky it was gone. At the time that it thus dipped through the portals of the horizon it was about thirty millions of miles from the earth, and, in round numbers, about as far again from the sun; that is, it was one third of the way on towards the sun when it turned its back upon the earth. The comet swept down from north to south almost along the line of a meridian, curving out the convexity of its sweep to the earth.

But the bright comet which appeared just below the belt of the constellation of Orion in 1843 accomplished its perihelion passage in a yet more impetuous and marvellous way. It passed within sixty thousand, instead of within sixty millions, of miles of the sun's flaming surface, and in doing so it swept through an arc of 292 degrees *in a single day*, leaving something less than a third part of a similar curve to be performed in all the remaining part of its journey, assuming that that journey lay in an elliptical orbit. It came round from behind the sun, and passed back in front of it, within the lapse of twenty-four hours; and on the following day it was seen in full daylight, not more than six of the sun's breadths away from its face. Sir John Herschel, in alluding to the very near approach to the sun made by this comet, pointed out that it must have been, at the instant, exposed to heat *forty-seven thousand times* more intense than the earth ever experiences. It passed, however, through this scorching ordeal with a velocity of 366 miles per second, which carried it well through the fiercest blaze of the appulse within a couple of hours.

The remarkable comet of 1843 also accomplished another marvellous feat at that same instant of time. It carried with it, at its perihelion passage, a very splendid tail, not less than 150 millions of miles long, and therefore stretching out from the head of the comet nearly as far again as the earth is away from the sun! Now it is an infallible attribute of comet-nature to deal with its tail after a fashion of its own. It carries it spread out conveniently and appropriately behind as it approaches the sun, and then, when it has got to its

nearest, it suddenly brandishes the tail round, and pushes it out before it as it moves off from the sun. The tail assumes the position of what has been very expressively and appositely termed a 'negative shadow;' that is, a beam of light, instead of a shadow of darkness, cast out from the sun behind the comet's head. As the comet moves past the great luminary, it sweeps round its tail as a sword may be conceived to be held out at arm's length, and then waved round the head, from one side to the opposite. But a sword with a blade 150 millions of miles long must be a somewhat awkward weapon to brandish round after this fashion. Its point would have to sweep through a curve stretching out more than 600 millions of miles; and, even with an allowance of two hours for the accomplishment of the movement, the flash of the weapon would be of such terrific velocity that it is not an easy task to conceive how any blade of connected material substance could bear the strain of the stroke. Even with a blade that possessed the coherence and tenacity of iron or steel, the case would be one that it would be difficult for molecular cohesion to deal with. But that difficulty is almost infinitely increased when it is a substance of much lower cohesive tenacity than either iron or steel that has to be subjected to the strain.

There would be at least some mitigation of this difficulty if it were lawful to assume that the substance which is subjected to this strain was not amenable to the laws of ponderable existence; if there were room for the notion that comets and their tails, which have to be brandished in such a stupendous fashion, were sky-spectres, immaterial phantoms, unreal visions of that negative shadow kind which has been alluded to. This, however, unfortunately is not a permissible alternative in the circumstances of the case. The great underlying and indispensable fact that the comet comes rushing up towards the sun out of space, and then shoots round that great centre of attraction by the force of its own acquired and ever-increasing impetuosity; the fact that it is obedient through this course to the law of elliptical, or to speak more exactly of conic-section, movement, permits of no doubt as to the condition of materiality. The comet is obviously drawn by the influence of the sun's mass, and is subservient to that all-pervading law of sympathetic gravitation that is the sustaining bond of the material universe. It is ponderable substance, beyond all question, and held by that chain of physical connexion which it was the glory of Newton to discover. If the comet were not a material and ponderable substance it would not gravitate

round the sun, and it would not move with increasing velocity as it neared the mighty mass until it had gathered the energy for its own escape in the enhanced and quickened momentum. In the first instance the ready obedience to the attraction, and then the overshooting of the spot from which it is exerted, combine to establish the comet's right to stand ranked at least amongst the ponderable bodies of space.

But comets are, beyond this, distinguished members of the ponderable confraternity on the ground of *size*. Anyone who has approached towards a really effective notion of what the enormity of the distance is that extends between the earth and the sun—a vast chasm that it would take the ordinary travelling speed of the railway more than three centuries to cross—and who has connected with this notion the statement already made in a preceding page that comets have been seen with tails trailed out into space nearly as far again as the earth is from the sun—will be quite prepared to admit that such must be the case. The head of the comet of 1811 measured 127,000 miles across, and the coma or external investment 643,000 miles. A body with such ample dimensions has, therefore, a good claim to be ranged among the giants, at least, of the system. It is not necessarily, however, as potent or influential as it is big. The distinction is one of size, rather than of power, as will presently be further shown.

The illustrious author of the *Theory of Universal Gravitation* conceived the idea, as a part of his grand system, that these giant luminaries of the sky were really ponderable bodies, moving in elliptical orbits about the sun, and remarked that they should be seen returning at regular periodical intervals to pay their obeisance to the great ruling orb of the system. It remained, however, for Edmund Halley, the second in the series of the distinguished men who have acted as the Astronomers Royal of England, and who happily was intimately associated with Newton in his labour of publishing the '*Principia*,' to prove the truth of this sagacious conception. Halley undertook to examine the circumstances under which some of the most remarkable of the earlier comets had been observed; and in doing so dealt first with the records of twenty-four well-known and well-authenticated visitants, and he soon came to the conclusion that three of the records referred to only one body; that, namely, which described a comet seen by Appian in 1531; that which related to a comet seen by Kepler in 1607; and that which gave the elements of a comet watched by himself with much interest in 1682. He

unhesitatingly announced that these were all instances of the return of one and the same luminary which was revolving in a very elongated ellipse about the sun, and which presented itself at these particular times within the range of human observation. By a subsequent extension of his investigation he found that there were conspicuous comets also seen in the years 1305, 1386, and 1456, which most probably were only earlier returns of the same visitant. There were slight irregularities in the periodic returns of these comets, but such only as seemed to Halley to prove, rather than to invalidate, his conclusion, because under the circumstance of the universality of gravitation it would only be in accordance with proper rule that there should be incidental augmentation and retardation of pace caused by the perturbing influence of planetary or other bodies that chanced to be near the course of the comet's movement. If the period of the planet Saturn were disturbed to the extent of several days by the influence of the neighbouring planet Jupiter, 'how much more liable to 'derangement,' to use Halley's own words, 'must a comet be 'whose excursion into space was four times greater than that of 'Saturn, and whose orbit was so eccentrically drawn out that 'if the velocity of the traveller were increased by the 120th 'part of its value, the elliptic course would be changed into 'a parabola!' Upon a final review of the whole argument, and taking into consideration the fact that the influence of Jupiter would of necessity be exerted in retarding the return of the comet, Halley ventured to prophesy that the same luminary should return into the range of human vision after another revolution of between seventy-five and seventy-six years, and that it should therefore be again seen from the earth at the end of 1758, or at the beginning of 1759.

Halley assumed the labours of Astronomer Royal at Greenwich at the advanced age of sixty-four years, in order that he might himself carry through a task which he had entered upon in the interests of astronomical science; namely, the uninterrupted observation of the movements of the moon through an entire cycle of its revolutions, which must occupy about nineteen years; and it is a notable fact in the annals of astronomy that the veteran observer accomplished this task notwithstanding the strength of the chances against his doing so. He ruled over the instrumental work of the Royal Observatory for a period of twenty-two years, and therefore saw the moon well through its round of recurring phases. He was less fortunate, however, in regard to the movements of his comet. He died in the beginning of the year 1742, when

the comet was still sixteen years' travel away from its predicted return. The anticipated visit was, nevertheless, not lost sight of. Astronomers looked anxiously forward to it at the appointed time. In 1757, as the anticipated visit approached, the French mathematicians Clairaut and Lalande undertook the more exact investigation of the probable influences of Jupiter and Saturn upon the movements of the comet, and they arrived at the conclusion that these planets should retard the return not less than 518 and 100 days respectively, and that therefore the period of the comet should be seventy-six years and 211 days, with the 13th of April, 1759, for the date of its next perihelion passage. The comet was observed approaching the earth by George Palitsch, an amateur Saxon astronomer, on the 25th of December, 1758, and it actually made its perihelion passage before the sun on the 13th of March, 1759; and in this way the discovery that comets do move in courses that are amenable to the great laws of material attraction and orderly elliptical movement was happily accomplished, and a remarkable experimental proof of the sufficiency of the Newtonian theory was secured. The comet of Halley, now of such surpassing interest, was again seen at its next return in the beginning of 1836, and it was then, fortunately, an object of close study to Sir John Herschel, who watched its passage, night after night, with the mirror of his large telescope. Mr. Hind, one of the best living authorities in matters of this class, believes that this interesting comet can be tracked back in the records of human chronology through not less than twenty-five returns.

Halley's comet, however, is not now alone in this peculiarity of orderly and predictable return. It has already a somewhat large band of associates in this particular. But most of the periodic comets are faint objects requiring powerful telescopes and technical skill for their observation. Of comets of this character there are several that are known to have short periods, reaching from three to sixteen years, and moving in elliptical paths that stretch scarcely as far from the sun as the orbit of Saturn. These periodic comets are, for the most part, distinguished in the annals of astronomical science by the names of the observers who picked them up with their telescopes during their passage amongst the stars. Prominent among these godfathers of comets stand the well-known astronomers Encke, Biela, Faye, D'Arrest, and Lexell. Five other comets besides the notorious one of Halley make wider excursions like it, and have periodic returns ranging between sixty-seven and seventy-four years. Some others stand narrowly

suspected of having periods of still longer measure. Coggia's Comet of the present year takes prominent rank among these, having had an elliptical orbit assigned to it by Schulhof, of Vienna, with an elongation from the sun 430 times larger than the earth's mean distance, and with a period of revolution of not less than 12,184 years. This comet is only surpassed in the length of its periodic excursion into space by the great comet of 1844, which is believed to have a period of 102,000 years!

Halley's method of fixing the identity of a comet depends upon observing that the successive returns occur after approximately equal intervals, and that on each return the luminary moves along nearly the same track among the stars. There is another plan, however, of accomplishing the same end of forecasting a comet's reappearance which proceeds upon an essentially different method, inasmuch as it works forwards instead of backwards. By this plan three distinct points of the comet's path among the stars require to be definitely ascertained, and then the curve in which the luminary is moving in the sky is traced out in continuation of the line connecting these points. If it appears that this trace lies along the course of an elliptical curve, which gives a closed figure in the extension returning into itself, it is then inferred that the comet is a periodic one, and will assuredly come back into sight again. But if, on the other hand, the track runs into a more open curve that passes on into a line that diverges for ever from the direction of approach, it is then inferred that the luminary which moves in this path must be an accidental and passing visitor coming once into the range of human vision and then vanishing for ever into the remote depths of space.

A catalogue of the bright comets that have been seen, however, by no means gives an adequate idea of the number of these luminaries that come under human observation. Three or four telescopic comets are now entered upon astronomical records every year. Lalande had a list of 700 comets that had been observed in his time. Arago's estimate of the number that must pass within the influence and range of the planetary system, at some time or other, amounted to 7,000,000! And this estimate of Arago's is well worthy of a passing thought, if it be only for the grand idea it affords of the enormity of space that finds room for 7,000,000 of bodies whirling about in all directions, although not more than three or four of the vast series can be caught by the observer in any single year. This result is obviously a natural consequence of the rapid way in which the bulk of a spherical space is augmented with the progressive enlargement of its radius.

The sun is 104 times as wide again as the earth; but it has a bulk many hundred thousand times as large again as the bulk of the earth. If the spherical dimensions of the sun be imagined to be expanded to anything like the available space of the surrounding universe, it will be comprehended how there may be many millions of comets circling in the spacious field, although not more than three or four of them can be seen at any one instant from the earth.

Whenever it happens that a large comet comes within convenient distance for observation the opportunity is eagerly seized to examine with unintermitting assiduity the appearances it presents as it passes through the ordeal of near approach to the sun. Newton was quite aware of the curious fact that the nucleus and head of a comet grow smaller as well as brighter on approach to the sun, and that they grow larger as well as fainter as they move into space. He explained this peculiarity by conceiving that the comet veiled itself in smoke as it passed before the glory of the sun's face, and then scattered the veil as it withdrew from the bright presence. Sir John Herschel probably advanced a step further in the line of reasonable explanation when he connected the condensation and brightening of the comet on its advance towards perihelion with the conversion of visible mist into transparent invisible air, and its subsequent enlargement and paling away with the re-condensation of transparent air into visible mist and cloud.

That this luminous mist, of which the chief bulk of the comet is composed, is a something of almost inconceivable fineness and rarity, is beyond all question. This is abundantly and incontrovertibly manifested by the slight physical influence which the filmy substance exerts when it comes into close relation with other ponderable bodies. In the year 1779, Lexell's comet approached so near to the earth that it would have increased the length of the sidereal year by three hours if its mass had been equal to the earth's. It would have increased the length of the sidereal year by one second if its mass had been equal to a five thousandth part of the earth's. It had, indeed, its own journey very materially retarded by the earth's influence; yet not only did it not change the length of the sidereal year even to the extent of a single second, but it did not even raise the tidal swell of the ocean in any perceptible degree. Both in the year 1767 and 1779 this comet passed through the midst of Jupiter's satellites, and became entangled temporarily among them. But not one of the satellites altered its movements to the extent of a hair's breadth, or of a tenth of an instant. This extreme tenuity of the

comet's substance is in some measure accounted for by the probable absence of any dense central mass that can control the elastic expansion of the light vaporous material. If the earth were to remain of its present size, but were reduced to the thousandth part of its present density, the surrounding atmosphere would forthwith spread out to many thousand times its present volume, and in doing so would approach towards the transformation of itself into a comet. Newton has very strikingly illustrated this view of the matter by pointing out that if a globe of air one inch in diameter were removed from the earth's surface four thousand miles, it would expand into a bulk capable of filling a sphere as large in circumference as the orbit of Saturn. In such a condition of tenuity it would be a veritable comet.

Substance even as rare and as filmy as this can move, nevertheless, in obedience to the law of centrifugal momentum and centralising attraction, simply because, however light and rare it may be in its intrinsic nature, its journey lies through intervals of space that are rarer still. There is in these intervals something that offers a resistance to even the filmy cometic substance. The long tail of the comet bends towards the regions of space that it is leaving; and Encke's Comet of short period is always two hours behind time in coming back to the end of its revolution of three years and 109 days. The vast fields of space are apparently filled with some subtle substance, through which the revolving orbs of the universe have to force their way, and by which the course of the filmy comet is perceptibly retarded, although it has no commensurate effect upon the speed of the more ponderous planet.

There is nearly always a point of superior brilliancy perceptible in the comet's head, which is termed its nucleus, and it is necessarily a matter of pressing interest to determine what this bright nucleus is; whether it is really a kernel of hard, solid substance, or merely a whiff of somewhat more condensed vapour. Newton, from the first, maintained that the comet is made partly of solid substance, and partly of an investinent of thin elastic vapours. If this is the case, it is manifest the central nodule of dense substance should be capable of intercepting light when it passes in front of a more distant luminary, such as a fixed star. Comets, on this account, have been watched very narrowly whenever they have been making such a passage. On August 18, 1774, the astronomer Messier believed that he saw a second bright star burst into sight from behind the nucleus of a comet which had concealed it the instant before. Another observer, Wartmann, in the year



1828, noticed that the light of an eighth magnitude star was temporarily quenched as the nucleus of Encke's Comet passed over it. Other observers entertained no less strong a conviction that the head of the comet, however bright it might be, was absolutely destitute of even the minutest centre of consolidation. Both Bessel and Sir John Herschel remarked that the brightest and most star-like nuclei that came under their notice were at once scattered into broad films of strongly illuminated cloud, when more penetrating telescopes were employed in viewing them. 'The real fact that underlies such discrepancies of opinion most probably is, that the question of the presence or absence of solid material in the comet's substance is one which is beyond the reach of telescopic observation. Sir John Herschel was fortunate in making one of the most interesting observations of the passage of a comet over a cluster of stars that has ever been secured. He was looking at Biela's Comet, with his large reflecting telescope of four feet aperture, in which it appeared as a small compact round disc of nebulous light three minutes across, when he saw this disc drift over a cluster of stars of the sixteenth and seventeenth magnitudes, and he noticed these minute luminaries shining brightly through the substance of the comet, estimated at the time as having a depth of at least 50,000 miles, although the slightest whisp of fog would certainly have effectually extinguished these stars. That even the densest parts of the majority of comets are without the power to effect any material diminution of light seems to have been fairly established in numerous instances. Sir W. Herschel followed the passage of the centre of the comet of 1795 over a very delicate double star, and noticed that even the fainter constituent remained clearly visible all the time. Struve saw a tenth magnitude star within a few seconds of the brightest part of Encke's Comet in 1828, and was satisfied that the light of the star was not enfeebled in the slightest degree. Bessel observed a tenth magnitude star within eight seconds of the nucleus of Halley's Comet in 1855, and noted carefully that the position of the star was not shifted by a hair's breadth, as it must have been by even a transparent medium of very trifling density.

An old notion, which conceived that comets are simply beams of light, has recently been revived. According to this view the tail of the comet is condensed sunshine thrown into a focal point where the bright spot of the nucleus appears, and the condensation is due to the lens-like action of the spherical mass of semi-transparent vapour which forms the body of the

comet, and which progressively increases in density towards the centre of the sphere. The comet is thus likened to a vast burning-glass many millions of miles wide, floating through the sunshine, and producing vivid incandescence in its focal point. This theory has the one recommendation that it easily and adequately accounts for the tail always lying in a direction away from the sun; it at once meets the case of the negative shadow. But it does not as satisfactorily explain the curving of the beam of sunshine towards the region from which the movement takes place. It has also the inconvenient attribute that the divergence of the pencil is in the wrong direction. The tail of the comet expands on the side of the nucleus that is away from the sun. The region of darkness also lies where, according to the condensation of light theory, the brightest part of the refracted beam should be found. Donati's Comet passed over the bright star Arcturus in 1858, and, as it did so, the star appeared brightened and magnified during the passage. But here, it will be observed, the magnified image of the star was formed millions of miles away from the comet. The quasi-parallel rays of light from the star were focussed at the earth after passing through the comet. It must also be added that each comet has its own speciality of distinctive form, instead of being merely an angular beam of light, as it should be if it were shaped by a merely optical operation.

A considerable portion of the light of the comet is, nevertheless, borrowed from the sun, for it has one property belonging to it that only reflected light can manifest. It is capable of being polarised by prisms of double-refracting spar. Polarisation of this character is only possible when the light that is operated upon has already been reflected from an imperfectly transparent medium. Some astronomers have argued that the comet cannot shine by reflected light, because the appearance of phases, such as are shown by the moon, are not presented by their heads as they pass round into appropriate positions in regard to the sun and earth. Some resemblance to the development of a phase was suspected in the case both of Donati's Comet and in the comet of 1844; but the appearance was very uncertain and confused, as if absorbed and masked in the comet's haze, and as it were merely a ball of thicker fog that was being illuminated, rather than a solid sphere. Even if there be solid masses in some of the mightiest of the comets, they are in all probability of dimensions too small to be able to manifest broad faces like the crescent, or oblate, moon. The whole question of the character of the illumination of the comet is, however, involved in considerable

difficulty. The mere polarisation of the light from a comet by no means proves that it is not a self-luminous body in any sense, because a body, shining by its own light, may also reflect light which it receives from other sources, and produce the effects of polarisation in virtue of this portion of its rays; and on the other hand it would appear that a vaporous body, which is dense enough to reflect light capable of polarisation, should also be dense enough to intercept some appreciable portion of light passing through it from faint stars, instead of allowing 17th magnitude stars to be seen through it with undiminished lustre.

When a good telescope is directed towards an approaching comet, it is first seen as a faint speck of luminous haze projected upon the dark sky. This hazy spot grows brighter and brighter as it gets nearer to the earth and the sun, until at last a central point of strong luminosity is seen to be surrounded by a faint circle of paler illumination. The brighter point is then spoken of as the nucleus of the comet, and the surrounding patch of luminosity is distinguished as its coma, or hair. As a general rule, however, these characteristics only become more perplexingly confused and indistinct when telescopes of high power are employed in examining them. They are best seen, indeed, with telescopes of low magnifying power and large field of view. When, nevertheless, bright comets happen to come very near to the sun, and are subjected to close observation under the advantages which the fine telescopes of the present day afford, a series of remarkable changes is found to take place in their luminous configuration. First, jets of bright light start out from the nucleus, and move through the fainter haze of the coma towards the sun; and then these jets are turned backwards round the edge of the coma, and stream from it, behind the comet, until they are fashioned into a tail. The advanced edge of these backward streams has the clear, well-defined aspect of steam rolling up into a cloud; the opposite edge is ragged and ill defined like the border of a dissolving rain-cloud. Under these circumstances of exceptionally good opportunity it becomes at once evident that the tail of the comet is in reality an emanation from the nucleus, and that it is called into existence in the first instance by the influence of the sun. The substance of the emanation is primarily drawn towards the sun; but its forward movement is then suddenly arrested, and reversed, and the luminous substance driven back, and away from the sun, until it is finally arranged, beyond the comet, as a forked tail, including a comparatively dark space between its diverging branches. The dark space is also

less distinctly seen extending between the nucleus and the brilliant margin of the head. Sir William Herschel conceived that the dark space surrounding, and extending behind, the nucleus represents a transparent atmosphere buoying up a luminous stratum of vapour towards its surface, and that the streaks of light are this upper shining layer seen, as it were, in the retiring direction of the spherical shell, and therefore in the line of greatest depth. But when this luminous outer stratum is very thick the whole of the comet's head seems bright, and there is no dark interspace around the nucleus. He imagined also that the tail was a continuation backwards of this spherical shell—a conical case attached by its narrower end to a hemispherical envelope. The aspect of the tail and of the luminous streams is however continually changing and fluctuating as vaporous masses of cloud-like structure might be conceived to do, and in some instances there has been a strong appearance even of an undulating movement.

This process of the formation of the comet's tail from luminous emanations was watched in the case of Donati's Comet, in 1858, by several observers, and under circumstances very much more advantageous than had ever before been possible. Among the distinguished astronomers who were fortunate enough to turn this good opportunity to practical account may be specially named Donati himself at Florence; Chacornac at Paris; Pape and Peters at Altona; Mœdler at Dorpat; Secchi and Rosa at Rome; Bond in the United States; and Carpenter, Dawes, Lassell, and Challis in England.

This comet had first been seen at Florence on the 2nd of June, as a mere patch of nebulous film, without any nuclear condensation. Its motion towards the sun was so deliberate at that time that no notable change in its distinctive aspect was perceived until the beginning of September. It then became visible to the naked eye, and threw out a tail. On the 10th of September this tail was three degrees long; but by the 6th of October it had grown to thirty-six degrees. On the 5th and 6th of October the comet was in its full splendour, and it was at that period a very magnificent object, the tail being sensibly curved, with the convex side uppermost, and in the direction of the comet's advance. On the 9th of October a second smaller tail appeared, with a kind of brush projecting from the convex side. The comet had then the form of a large ostrich feather waved gently by the hand. At the beginning of the month of September the nucleus was distinctly manifest, and was placed eccentrically within the head. On the 16th

of September two diverging streams of light shot out from the nucleus across the coma, and, having separated to about the extent of its diameter, they turned back abruptly and streamed out in the tail. Luminous substance could be distinctly seen rushing out from the nucleus, and then flowing back into the tail. M. Rosa described the streams of light as resembling long hair brushed upwards from the forehead, and then allowed to fall back on each side of the head. On September 22 the 'hair-parting' changed its aspect into the form of an expanded fan with a comparatively dark arc intervening between two concentric semicircles of light. On September 27 the fan spread itself out still more widely, and looked something like the crescent of Venus, with the line of the cusps of the crescent crossing the central axis of the tail perpendicularly, and with the nucleus brightly defined on the inner edge of the crescent. The comet made its perihelion passage on September 30, and at that time the dark region of the tail, behind the nucleus, was very distinct and boldly marked, especially near the nucleus, and the axis of the fan-shaped head was inclined twenty-five degrees to the line of greater darkness in the tail.

Immediately after the perihelion passage it became apparent that there were three distinct films or envelopes of light disposed round the nucleus—an outer one very pale and diffused; a second brighter and more sharply defined, and having the form of the glory commonly placed by artists round the head of a saint; and a third, separated from the second by a less luminous interval, and increasing in brightness towards the nucleus until it became inseparably blended with it. The space beyond the nucleus was intensely black through an angular space of about ninety degrees. A full week after the perihelion passage the outermost envelope was losing its regular form; the nucleus was becoming ragged, like the ill-defined border of a rain-cloud during a heavy shower; the dark space beyond the nucleus was enlarging itself, and the divergent streamers of the tail were curving in to transform the head of the comet into a circular nebulosity. From the 15th to the 22nd of October the nucleus threw out intermittingly from itself appendages having the form of brilliant comma-shaped masses of incandescent substance twisted violently backward. Padre Secchi accounts for these very remarkable changes of configuration by the influence first of the sun's heat upon the comet's substance as it approached towards perihelion, and afterwards by the production in the luminous emanations thus generated of enormous tides

and perturbation derangements. Some of the most conspicuous of these luminous developments occurred on October 11, when the comet was at its nearest approach to the earth; and on October 17, when it was nearest to the planet Venus. He has no doubt that the close neighbourhood of the earth and Venus at those times was the effective cause of the sudden changes of aspect, and that those changes of aspect may be accepted as proof that the comet's substance consists of really ponderable material. Newton attributed the formation of the comet's tail to luminous vapour being carried along by currents of the ether of space, which were themselves set up by the heat caught from the sun by the vapour, and he conceived that the substance of the comet was in process of being dispersed into space through its tail. Kepler fancied that the tail was merely the lighter vapour of the comet driven forward by the impulse of the solar rays; and a French astronomer of the seventeenth century, Claude Couriers, improved this notion into a very elegant theory, which was looked upon with considerable favour by Whiston, Euler, William Herschel, Laplace, Delambre, and Arago, and which affirmed that the cometic nebosity was so highly rarefied on its approach to the sun as to be unable to resist the impact of the sunbeams when they fell upon it. Bessel and M. Faye maintained that no merely material or mechanical action of the sun, or mutual attraction of material particles, such as gravitation, could be accepted as sufficiently explaining the appearances produced in comets at the time of their perihelia, but that they must be referred finally to some imperfectly understood operation of an electro-magnetic character. Bessel first advanced these views, in perhaps rather complicated and obscure phraseology, at the end of a memoir upon Halley's Comet, which he printed in No. 302 of the '*Astronomische Nachrichten*.' From the expressions in that memoir, it appears that Bessel thinks the part of the comet which is most directed towards the sun becomes converted into vapour by the sun's heat when the comet has got near enough, and that the vapour thus generated is then drawn in towards the sun's mass by the ordinary influence of gravitation, until a new force, of a different character and of a repulsive energy, is called into play, and that then by this new force the luminous substance is suddenly arrested in its forward movement, and driven backwards, beyond the nucleus, until it streams out there into the tail. Professor Tyndall, again, having found in certain experiments that air passed into a glass tube over a small pellet of porous paper containing

the minutest possible trace of particular volatile substances, becomes a bright white cloud under the beam of the electric light, urges that matter of almost infinite tenuity may be clothed with light of higher intensity than that which comets give, and that comets may be substantially 'actinic clouds' of this character resulting from the *chemical* influence of the sun's rays upon thin vapour. He believes that a few ounces of the vapour of 'iodide of allyl' might be 'manufactured' in this way into a luminous cloud as large and bright as Donati's Comet. All the large comets which have been observed since powerful telescopes have been at the command of astronomy, agree, more or less, in presenting the phenomena which have been described, and only differ from each other to the extent to which varying distance from the sun and varying velocity of movement may be presumed to affect the result. Mr. Lockyer observed the development of the luminous envelopes in Coggia's Comet with the large refracting telescope of Mr. Newall, at Ferndene, Gateshead, which has an aperture of twenty-five inches, and described the head of the comet as a fan-shaped projection of light, with ear-like appendages at each side, which sympathetically complemented each other at every change either of form or luminosity, and which had all the appearance of being parts of two eccentrically arranged envelopes. The straight sides, or radial borders, of the fan were at times altogether obliterated by the streams of light passing down backwards into the tail. Immediately behind the nucleus there was the usual gap, or angular region of deep darkness, which gradually passed in the more remote parts of the tail into a uniformly-spread luminous haze. Mr. Lockyer read these configurations as strongly suggesting *the notion of a meteor whirl*, in which the regions of greatest brightness were caused by the different coils, cutting, or appearing to cut, each other, and so in those parts leading to compression or condensation and frequent collision of the luminous particles.

When Donati's magnificent comet was displaying its glories to human eyes in 1858, there was one powerful instrument of research wanting to human science which has since been added to its repertory, and which happily, therefore, was at the command of astronomy when Coggia's Comet occupied the field. The spectroscope and its methods of investigation have been developed since that earlier time, and the instrument has been very assiduously, and in some particulars successfully, directed towards the nucleus and envelopes of Coggia's luminary. Mr. Lockyer used it with the flood of light furnished by the hitherto

unprecedentedly large aperture of Mr. Newall's telescope, and he found that the notion that some of the rays of the comet are sent either from solid particles, or from vapour in a state of very high condensation, is amply confirmed; and also that there is no less clear evidence that other portions of the comet's light issue from the vapour shining by its own inherent right. The light coming from the more dense constituents, and therefore giving a continuous coloured spectrum, was, however, deficient in blue rays, and was most probably emitted by material substance at the low; red and yellow, stages of incandescence. In describing his spectroscopic examination, Mr. Lockyer says :—

‘The luminous fan also gave a continuous spectrum but little inferior in brilliancy to that of the nucleus itself; while over this, and even from the dark space behind the nucleus, were distinguishable the spectrum of *bands*, indicating the presence of rare vapour of some kind; while the continuous spectrum of the nucleus and fan might be referred to the presence of either denser vapour or of solid particles.’

Other observations, by Padre Secchi at Rome, substantially confirm this conclusion, and seem to point to either carbon, or an oxide of carbon, as the source of the bright luminous bands—a ‘lead’ which has been vivaciously followed up by the Abbé Moigno, when he asks whether this comet may not after all be ‘un gigantesque diamant volatilisé.’ Whatever may be the answer hereafter given to that question, the verdict of the spectroscope is clearly to the effect that the comet is made up of a commingling of thin vapour and of denser particles, either compressed into the condition of solidification, or into some physical state approaching to that condition, and is therefore entirely in accordance with the notion formed on other grounds that the nucleus of the comet is a cluster of solid nodules or granules, and that the luminous coma and tail are jets and jackets of vapour, associated with the more dense ingredients, and swaying and streaming about them as heat and gravity, acting antagonistic ways, determine.

It is a natural consequence of the manner in which comets appear to have been sown ‘broadcast’ in space, that they travel in all conceivable directions, and shoot into sight from all possible points of the starry sphere. The planets, which are associated into a connected family, travel around the sun in planes that, with some trifling and unimportant exceptions, are restricted to the zodiacal zone. Comets, on the other hand, may arrive from the north, or south, or east, or west; and more often, as was indeed the case with Coggia's Comet, quite transversely to the more orderly paths of the planets. Some



also come out of space by the general direction along which others travel when they withdraw into space after they have made their perihelion obeisance. The 'watchmen' who keep their keen outlook for comets, therefore, do not limit their search to any one particular tract of the starry heavens. This scattered order of the comets' array, of its own accord, and without other supports, intimates that they are really 'wanderers' of the universe in most instances, passing on from system to system, and from sun to sun, and that those particular individuals which move in elliptical and recurring paths are but chance visitants from the wandering band which have been caught by solar or planetary attraction, and turned by it out of their original vagrant path into more orderly courses.

The following up of the curve in which any comet appears to be traversing space, when it passes the neighbourhood of the earth, so as to determine whether it is still wandering vaguely, or revolving elliptically, is however a task of exceeding delicacy, and one that cannot always be performed with unerring certainty. If the curve of the path, so long as it is in sight from the earth, be in the line of the conic section which is known to the mathematician as the hyperbola, then there is no doubt that the passing visitant is about to depart upon a journey into space from which it will never return. The hyperbola is a figure which is, so to speak, like a pair of compasses with open legs, the curve being the sweep round the joint which connects leg with leg. A comet which travels in such a course comes up out of space along the one straight leg, sweeps round the joint, and moves back into space by the other leg; and as the legs diverge from each other towards their points, the comet goes off for ever from the line along which it has arrived. But it so happens that there is yet another form of curve, which is known to the mathematician as the parabola, in which this divergent curvature is drawn in so very near to the curvature of the continuous ellipse that it is not possible to say from the mere examination of a small portion of the track whether it is really of the nature of the hyperbola or of the ellipse. The curve is a limiting one, which opens under the most trivial amount of expansion from quickened velocity into a hyperbola, or closes under an equally minute amount of contraction from diminished velocity into an ellipse of exceedingly great elongation, or eccentricity. Very many of the comets observed from the earth appear to be moving in this parabolic course of doubtful and undeterminable character, and then as a mere matter of convenience they are conceived to be travelling in paths which describe ellipses that are so infinitely long as to

be practically immeasurable. Such comets should repeat their visits to the neighbourhood of the earth, but they should only do so after very long intervals of absence, and in their cases it is always a matter of exceeding, and often of insurmountable difficulty, to say how long such absences should be.

Burckhardt's Comet of 1723, Encke's Comet of 1771, the comet of 1774, Rosenberg's and Schwabe's Comet of 1818, and the comets of 1824 and 1840, all belong to the class that may fairly be considered vagrants of space, moving in aberrant hyperbolas. Several other comets have been marked as having elliptical paths so long that the successive returns into sight only occur after the lapse of hundreds, or of even thousands, of years. All the other comets that have been observed move in elliptical orbits so limited in size that they never pass anywhere beyond the boundaries of the planetary system, and these all agree in the remarkable and important particulars, that they travel in paths that have the same general direction in space as the orbits of the planets, and that they move the same way with the planets, that is, from west to east. These comets are consequently looked upon as being properly a constituent part of the planetary system.

There is one of these comets of short period, or, to speak more exactly, a comet that at one time was believed to be of this character, which has a history of its own so peculiar and notable as to require some passing mention. This comet made its first recognised appearance in the sky in 1770, and was at that time observed by two very accomplished and competent astronomers, namely, Lexell and Burckhardt, who at once agreed in assigning the visitor an elliptical path that should be traversed completely in a trifle less than six years. The luminary, however, did not fulfil the expectations that had been formed for it, and did not return at the expiration of the appointed time. Lexell, then, after a further examination of its course, became convinced that this comet was originally one of the aberrant vagrants of space, but that in the year 1767 it was brought by its vagrant path so near to the planet Jupiter that it was caught by that planet's attraction, and swerved into a new line of movement—the one, namely, in which it was subsequently seen moving in 1770. In this new path it had again travelled on until it once more came into the close neighbourhood of Jupiter. This happened in 1779, and the comet was then once more acted upon by the planet's attraction, and this time swayed by it back into a divergent path, which whisked it away for ever out of sight of human eyes. The periodic orbit was merely a brief episode in the comet's

history, accidentally brought about by the agency of Jupiter. The celebrated French mathematician, Laplace, afterwards examined the facts of this temporary conversion of a hyperbolic orbit into an elliptical one, and substantially confirmed the conclusion at which Lexell had arrived as to the cause of the comet's disappearance, and in doing this he further ascertained that on its second approach to Jupiter the comet had been nearer to the planet than its own fourth satellite, and that it was at that time in a position where the planet's attraction must have been two hundred times greater than the attraction of the sun. It was upon this auspicious occasion that the discovery was made of the surpassingly small mass of the comet, because the satellites of the planet did not suffer the slightest derangement or disturbance from the intrusion of this unlooked-for visitant into their system.

There is another of the group of 'short period' comets that also has a history requiring a few special words of notice. On February 27, 1826, M. Biela, an Austrian officer residing at Josephstadt, in Bohemia, discovered a comet in the constellation of Aries, which at that time was seen as a small round speck of filmy cloud. Its course was watched during the following month by M. Gambart at Marsilles, and by M. Clausen at Altona, and those observers assigned to it an elliptical orbit, with a period of six years and three quarters for the revolution. M. Damoiseau subsequently undertook to add to the calculations of its path an estimate of the influence that should be exerted over it by the earth, Jupiter, and Saturn, and found that the return of the comet should be retarded from this cause by 9.6642 days, and that, with this allowance, the comet was due at its next perihelion on November 27, 1832. In carrying out this investigation, M. Damoiseau remarked that the comet would cross the plane of the earth's orbit within 20,000 miles of its track, but about one month before the earth would have arrived at the same spot. Some measure of alarm was caused by the announcement of this close shave, and various speculations soon became rife as to what the consequences might have been, whether to the earth or to the comet, if the shave had been a yet closer one. The comet was fairly punctual in keeping the appointment for its perihelion return, and it came back again into the same position, with a like observance of the virtue of punctuality, both in 1839 and in 1846. On the latter occasion it was noticed, however, that either from its approximate contact with the earth, or more probably from some cause connected with the divergent action of the sun, it had been split into two

halves, and that the two halves were travelling on quite unconcernedly abreast, and about sixteen thousand miles, or twice the measure of the earth's diameter, asunder. The one half was a trifle fainter than the other, but each had a tail of its own, and both tails were carried symmetrically ranged at right angles with the line connecting the two heads. This very remarkable disruption of the comet was first noticed by Professor Challis, at Cambridge, on January 15; but it was also observed and put on record, almost simultaneously, by M. Wichmann at Königsberg, and by Lieutenant Maury at Washington, so that the evidence of the occurrence was altogether unimpeachable. M. Plantamour, of Geneva, forthwith examined the movements of the two halves of the disrupted luminary, and ascertained that they were travelling in the path which was approximately the proper one for the original comet, and that they were holding on their course steadily abreast of each other, and without changing the distance which severed them, as they moved on into space beyond the range of human vision.

From this period, however, the further destinies of the disrupted luminary were kept under a cloud for a considerable time, and the puzzled astronomers were left in a state of tantalising uncertainty as to what had become of it. At the beginning of the year 1866 this feeling of bewilderment gained expression in the Annual Report of the Council of the Royal Astronomical Society. The matter continued nevertheless in the same state of provoking uncertainty for another six years. The third period of the perihelion passage had then passed, and nothing had been seen of the missing luminary. But on the night of November 27, 1872, night watchers were startled by a sudden and a very magnificent display of falling stars or meteors, of which there had been no previous forecast, and Professor Klinkerflues, of Berlin, having carefully noted the common radiant point in space from which this star-shower was discharged into the earth's atmosphere, with the intuition of ready genius jumped at once to the startling inference that here at last were traces of the missing luminary. There were eighty of the meteors that furnished a good position for the radiant point of the discharge, and that position, strange to say, was very much the same as the position in space which Biela's Comet should have occupied just about that time on its fourth return towards perihelion. Klinkerflues, therefore, taking this spot as one point in the path of the comet, and carrying the path on as a track into forward space, fixed the direction there through which it should pass as a 'vanishing point' at the

other side of the starry sphere, and having satisfied himself of that farther position he sent off a telegram to the other side of the world, where alone it could be seen—that is to say to Mr. Pogson, of the Madras Observatory—which may be best told in its own nervous and simple words.

Herr Klinkerflues' telegram to Mr. Pogson, of Madras, was to the following effect:—

'November 30.—Biela touched the earth on the 27th<sup>o</sup> of November. Search for him near Theta Centauri.'

The telegram reached Madras, through Russia, in one hour and thirty-five minutes, and the sequel of this curious passage of astronomical romance may be appropriately told in the words in which Mr. Pogson replied to Herr Klinkerflues' pithy message. The answer was dated Madras, the 6th of December, and was in the following words:—

'On the 30th of November, at 16 hours, the time of the comet rising here, I was at my post, but hopelessly; clouds and rain gave me no chance. The next morning I had the same bad luck. But on the third trial, with a line of blue break, about 17½ hours mean time, *I found Biela immediately!* Only four comparisons in successive minutes could be obtained, in strong morning twilight, with an anonymous star; but direct motion of 2·5 seconds decided that I had got the comet all right. I noted it—circular, bright, with a decided nucleus, but no tail, and about forty-five seconds in diameter. Next morning I got seven good comparisons with an anonymous star, showing a motion of 17·9 seconds in twenty-eight minutes, and I also got two comparisons with a Madras star in our current Catalogue, and with 7734 Taylor. I was too anxious to secure one good place for the one in hand to look for the other comet, and the fourth morning was cloudy and rainy. I used power 99 on the Equatorial of Troughton and Simms, eighteen inches in diameter, but I could see the comet well in the finder. At a guess I should describe it as three times as bright as cluster 80 Messier, in the field with R. S. and T. Scorpii.'

Herr Klinkerflues' commentary upon this communication was that he forthwith proceeded to satisfy himself that no provoking accident had led to the discovery of a comet altogether unconnected with Biela's, although in this particular place, and that he was ultimately quite confident of the identity of the comet observed by Mr. Pogson with one of the two heads of Biela. It was subsequently settled that Mr. Pogson had, most probably, seen both heads of the comet, one on the first occasion of his successful search, and the second on the following day, and the meteor shower experienced in Europe on November 27 was unquestionably due to the passage near the earth of a meteoric trail travelling in the track of the comet. When the question of a possible collision

was mooted in 1832, Sir John Herschel remarked that such an occurrence might not be unattended with danger, and that on account of the intersection of the orbits of the earth and the comet a rencontre would in all likelihood take place within the lapse of some millions of years. As a matter of fact the collision did take place on November 27, 1872, and the result, so far as the earth was concerned, was a magnificent display of aerial fireworks! But a more telling piece of ready-witted sagacity than this prompt employment of the telegraph for the apprehension of the nimble delinquent can scarcely be conceived. The sudden brush of the comet's trail, the instantaneous telegram to the opposite side of the world, and the glimpse thence of the vagrant luminary as it was just whisking itself off into space towards the star Theta Centauri, together constitute a passage that stands quite without a parallel in the experience of science. The 'Biela touched the earth on November 27. Search for him near Theta Centauri' of Herr Klinkerflues, well deserves to be placed on the tablets of scientific history by the side of Leverrier's instructions to Dr. Galle on September 23, 1846, to point his telescope to the previously unseen planet Neptune.

In connexion with this account of Klinkerflues' identification of the comet of Biela with a meteoric shower, it is necessary however to add that the great facts of the identity of meteoric streams with comets had been already suspected on other grounds. It has long been remarked that there are two nights in the year—namely, that of August 10, and that of November 13, when splendid displays of meteors commonly occur; and it has also been noticed that the meteors in each of these instances have a common radiant point in the heavens, from which they burst, as 'falling stars,' to complete their precipitation to the earth, through the earth's atmosphere. Professor Newton, of the United States of America, collected and examined thirteen several accounts of the occurrence of a meteor shower on November 13, and he came to the conclusion, as a result of his calculations, that the regular periodic fall of these meteors was due to the existence of a group of bodies which revolved in a settled orbit with a period of either 180, 185, 354, or 376 days, or of thirty-three years and a quarter. Professor Adams subsequently found that the first four of these presumed periods were inadmissible, but that the period of thirty-three years would really satisfy the conditions of the case. Professor Schiaparelli, the director of the Milan Observatory, then drew up a

memoir, which was printed in No. 1629 of the 'Astronomische Nachrichten,' in which he pointed out that the path assumed for this meteor stream was virtually identical with the course which had already been assigned to the comet of 1866, known as Tempel's Comet, for an orbit. He placed in his memoir, side by side, the corresponding places and elements of the meteors and of the comet, and showed by this comparison that they were in the closest agreement. He afterwards, in another communication, on December 31, 1866, traced a similar resemblance between a path that had been deduced for the periodic meteors of August 13, and the orbit that had been assigned to comet III, known as the Great Comet of 1862, by Dr. Oppolzer. It must, therefore, be understood that Herr Klinkerflues had these previous determinations to give the bent to his own brilliant and shrewd apprehension of the character of the meteor shower in 1872.

The comet of 1866, which has been identified with the November meteor showers, was first seen as a comet in the year A.D. 126. It returned in its regular periodic path at intervals of  $33\frac{1}{4}$  years fifty-two times after that, but only gave indications of its approach to the neighbourhood of the earth on those occasions by the showers of meteors that it scattered upon it until the year 1866, when it was once again seen as a comet. This luminary moves in a very lengthened ellipse, which extends out from the sun a little beyond the planet Uranus, and as it does so it leaves a trail of material particles behind it in its path not less than 1,772 millions of miles long—so long in fact, that the earth pursuing its yearly course returns three times into the trail before this has swept along quite out of its way. The consequence is that there are meteor showers on this particular day of the year for three years in succession; but that after that there are no such showers for the next thirty years, which are consumed by the trail in getting through the rest of the comet's orbit, because the earth during that time only crosses the void portions of the track. The comet of 1862, which has been identified with the August meteors, has a period of 145 years, and moves in that period through an orbit which runs out from the sun as far again as Uranus, and which therefore extends quite to the remote confines of the solar system. But in this case there appears to be a continuous and absolutely unintermitting trail of material particles quite round the vast orbit, so that the earth always finds a meteor shower there every year, when it gets back to the part of its own orbit which touches the trail. The August meteors have thus been shown

to be a stream of minute bodies 4,043,520 miles broad where the earth plunges through it, and extending through an elliptical course that has a span of 10,988 millions of miles for its greatest diameter. This stream is annually crossed by the earth in six hours, and during those hours meteors appear in the sky of that portion of the earth that is to the front in encountering the stream.

There is no difficulty at all in apprehending what it is that takes place when the earth plunges in this way through the stream. The meteors are rushing on in their own proper path with a speed of about 1,660 miles in the minute, and at the instant of their encounter with the earth it is moving, on its part, with the speed of 1,140 miles in the minute. Entering the earth's atmosphere, under these conditions, the meteoric mass is stopped in its movement by the resistance of the air, and immediately becomes amenable to the earth's attraction, and begins to fall to the ground. As it does this the forward momentum of the mass is transformed into molecular vibration, which first takes effect in fusing, and then immediately afterwards in igniting, the substance, and so it becomes converted into a shining as well as a 'falling' star. The meteor is in this way raised to an intense white heat, and is then dissipated into vapour, which is seen trailing along in the sky either as a luminous track, or as a streak of gleaming white cloud. In most instances the burning meteor is extinguished before it strikes the earth. Few, indeed, of the meteors ever retain solid coherence so long, but are dispersed entirely into vapour, which blends itself with the atmosphere. When the meteors do strike the earth as solids they bury themselves in the soil, and may subsequently be disinterred from it in the form known as the Meteoric Stone, or Aerolite.

The meteoric masses which are encountered in the case of the August meteor shower are estimated to vary in size from nodules of ninety grains to nodules of eight pounds, and to be scattered through space with an average distance of 400 miles, but with occasional gaps of many hundred times greater extent. In reference to the enormous numbers of bodies of this class that are scattered in space, Professor Newton remarks that as many as seven millions and a half of meteors, large enough to make themselves visible to the naked eye, and probably as many as forty times that number of smaller ones, often enter the earth's atmosphere in a single night, and that the great circular stratum of space which contains the planets is in reality traversed by an altogether innumerable myriad of such bodies. It will, of course, be easily understood that this



estimate of the number of meteors is based upon the fact of the mighty stretch of nocturnal sky around the earth. The counting of 100 meteors by a single observer only means that 100 meteors have entered the comparatively narrow segment of the atmosphere that lies within the reach of that observer's vision, and of such ranges there are thousands comprised within a hemisphere of the earth.

The identification, in certain remarkable instances, of meteor streams with comets, thus conclusively settles the fact that comets do contain some solid elements in their composition. This is the assurance which meteors have added to telescopic and spectroscopic investigations of the physical nature of comets. It must, however, be understood that it is by no means meant that the tails of the comets are streams of meteors. The tails of the comets are vaporous emanations ejected out beyond the nucleus by the influence of the sun. The meteor streams are trails of solid corpuscles dropped behind the nucleus, as it rushes on in its curving path. The November and August meteors have been selected as the most convenient and perhaps striking instances of this periodic occurrence of star showers; but they do not stand alone, now, as the representatives of this class of bodies. At least one hundred other meteor-systems, of a similar character, have been either suspected or ascertained. It is also conceived to be most probable that comets are lengthened out, and drawn more into the state of continuous meteor trails, with successive returns into the sphere of the sun's attraction. In this point of view the November meteors may be held to be gradually and progressively passing on into the state of the August meteors, and to mark, as it were, the intermediate stage by which comets are transformed into meteor streams.

The sketch of this interesting fragment of Physical History has, so far, been one of continuous and smooth inductive progress, and the demonstration is, to this point, singularly complete. But even here the subject is not finally exhausted. There still remains one other, and one very remarkable, page to be turned. If there are these countless systems of connected and orderly meteoric streams setting in various directions through space, has science nothing further to say as to the sources from which these streams have been primarily issued? The answer which Nature itself immediately supplies to this question is in no sense less wonderful and complete than the other steps of the argument which have been passed in review. It has been, in the first place, for a long time known that the mighty sun is itself one fertile source of meteoric emanation. The coronal

halo of glory which is seen surrounding its eclipsed face when the dark body of the moon intervenes between it and the earth, is at that time observed to consist of radiant streaks shooting forth in all directions around, and is now held to be made up of jets of comparatively minute solid particles thrown off from the sun, and scintillating in its beams. The zodiacal light which stretches out so far beyond the coronal halo into the twilight is now deemed but the outer extremities of those jets reaching so far into space that the ponderable matter of which they are composed is left free to enter upon a course of sustained orbital circling round the sun, instead of falling back at once to the solar surface as the nearer ones which constitute the coronal appendage are constrained to do. The dark spots discerned from time to time upon the sun's bright disc are now looked upon as stupendous craters in the sun from which these radiant streams are cast forth in endless succession by a veritable process of eruption. Under appropriate management ruddy flames, or rather ruddy outbursts of hot vapour, are seen rising from the sun as a part of this eruptive process, to distances as vast as a hundred thousand miles; and a ready calculation has shown that if light vapours can be carried so far by the eruptive force, the more ponderable matters that accompany the vapours as the lava-bombs accompany the steam-jets of the terrestrial volcano, must of necessity be shot so much further than the light vapours that some of them must get to distances where they would be abandoned in the circumsolar space to their own momental impetuosities, and be left to circle in orbits of their own, around the great centre of attraction, under the well-known influences and laws of elliptical movement. The immediate neighbourhood of the sun, indeed, under successive discoveries of this class, has come to be contemplated as a shining ocean of meteoric emission, instead of, as it was once conceived to be, a desolate stretch of void space. In a remarkable book written by Mr. Mattieu Williams, and called 'The Fuel of the Sun,' in which the main object of the author is to suggest that the heat-energy of the great luminary is maintained by the rushing of the mighty orb, with a velocity of 500,000 miles per day, through a universally diffused thin atmosphere of mingled oxygen and nitrogen, a hundred thousand times more rare than air at the sea-level, Mr. Williams remarks in pointed and expressive allusion to the theme under consideration:—

'The zodiacal light presents exactly the phenomena required to satisfy these theoretical requirements. Here is a lenticular zone of nebulous matter having just the form and position which a dense

cluster of solid particles projected out from the spot-regions on either side of the solar equator should attain if those particles continued their journey far beyond the visible limits of the corona, and then, at varying distances, terminated their radial excursion in the curvilinear resultant of the two forces of explosive projection and solar gravitation.'

And then in another passage he as pertinently adds:—

'It is but a step from the Meteoric Zone, crossing the orbit of the earth, to the zone of the Asteroids, the pocket-planets beyond the orbit of Mars; a step that for a projectile is practically shortened by the continuous diminution of the reclaiming force of solar gravitation. It is but like a gradation from meteoric dust to meteoric grains, then to the meteoric pebbles, nodules, and masses weighing hundreds of pounds, and even tons, that have fallen upon the earth, to the smallest of the asteroids, and from them to Pallas, the giant of the series, whose bulk is 2,177 times less than that of the earth. It is perfectly consistent that the larger masses should be projected to the greatest distance; and also that the more tremendous and profound the whirling tempest in the sun, the greater must be the dimensions of solid masses that would be torn out of its depths.'

But yet once again. It has been observed that the great outer planets of our system are frequent stumbling-blocks to wandering comets; they are constantly getting in their way. In other words, there appears to be a marked tendency among certain individuals of the 'comets of short period' to group themselves into sympathetic relations with these planets, and to make them, as it were, secondary foci of their regulated movements. For a long time the frequent return of comets of short period into the neighbourhood of Jupiter and Saturn was conceived to be but an accidental exertion, by these ponderous giants of the system, of their attractive power for less massive aggregations of matter that chanced to come within the pale of their influence. More recent investigations into the physical aspect of these outer planets appear to have supplied a much grander and more comprehensive interpretation of the sympathy. There can now scarcely be a doubt that the restless eruptions and explosive operations which are so intimately connected with the inner life, and with the maintenance of the physical energy of the sun, are by no means confined to that mighty central sphere, but that they are reproduced in an inferior degree in the dependent system of planets. The great sphere of the planet Jupiter, which sweeps along so majestically in the outer confines of the system, is certainly anything but a fixed and settled orb of solid unchanging uniformity. As long back as November 1834, Schwabe had drawn attention to spots upon the disc of this planet which resembled small spots on the sun, having nuclei surrounded

‘by penumbraë;’ and which at times split up and dissolved, just after the manner of sun spots. The dark belts continually visible upon the planet are unquestionably the more transparent parts of a voluminous mobile atmosphere that afford glimpses into deeper regions of vapour still far above any nucleus of central solidification. They are the counterparts of the dark maculæ of the sun, modified by the circumstances of different bulk, temperature, and rotatory impulse. Mattieu Williams says, in regard to this deeply interesting and most beautiful planet:—

‘I have little doubt that Jupiter is still red-hot, or rather *white-hot*, that a vast depth of aqueous or other vapour surrounds it, and that these, together with the free oxygen and nitrogen, form a very much greater atmosphere than that which I have calculated. I think it extremely probable that the temperature of the dissociation of water’ (that is, the separation of its constituent elements under the circumstance of a temperature too high to allow their chemical union to be maintained) ‘has been reached by the original atmospheric compression of Jupiter; that it must have manifested some degree of general solar phenomena; and that if we could see it shaded from the solar rays it would appear like a phosphorescent, or rather fluorescent, ball, by the illumination of its vaporous envelope, due to the light which it absorbs from the glowing world within.’

Mattieu Williams calculates that the atmospheric pressure upon the surface of the contained solid nucleus of Jupiter cannot be less than 740 lbs. to the square inch, which would be only balanced by a column of mercury 134 feet high, and that the compression alone of this weight must generate a temperature in the lower regions of the atmosphere of at least 2,259 degrees of Fahrenheit, which is about the melting-point of cast-iron. Jupiter, therefore, must be ranked as a miniature or subordinate sun, rather than as a finished and consolidated world, reproducing in its outer region of rule many of the same operations and manifestations of energy and originative force that are evinced by its great solar prototype in the central focus of the system, and possibly conferring upon its little family of dependent satellites the same benefit and service that the vitalising sun affords to the nearer planets of its family. But if this is the case, Jupiter should have its streams of dependent meteorites moving in eccentrically recurring paths, as well as its cluster of satellite-worlds; and the comets of short period that return to the neighbourhood of Jupiter should be those meteor streams that have primarily issued from the planet itself as results of eruptive force, rather than chance wanderers, that have been drawn to the planet and

chained to its chariot wheels as the captives of its aggressive prowess.

All that has been said of Jupiter applies with equal force to the planet Saturn. This planet contains the volume of 1,397 earths, but its specific weight, viewed as a whole, is not more than it would have if made up entirely of coal. It is lighter, mass for mass, than Jupiter—lighter even than an equal bulk of water. This lightness emphatically points to high temperature, relatively small size of the central nucleus of consolidation, and large amount of rare vapours. Spots have been seen upon its surface similar to those which have been alluded to as present upon Jupiter. It has broad shaded belts, and lighter streaks of changing cloud; and, above all, it shines with a golden light, which, far more than the pale splendour of Jupiter, speaks of independent and inherent powers of illumination. The reflection of sunshine from a coating of white clouds would assuredly not furnish this golden tinge, but a bright self-luminous photosphere shining through a veil of white clouds, adapted to absorb the blue rays of the light, would do so. But Saturn does not stop in the testimony it offers at this point. It has a more remarkable argument to contribute which is also essentially its own. Mattieu Williams refers to this very strikingly, in speaking of the probable condition of the planet, in a passage in which he says:—

‘The flaming prominences, the volleys of the corona, the zodiacal light, the meteor rings, and the zone of the asteroids, should be repeated on a scale which, though but in miniature compared with the meteoric efforts of the sun, should be relatively to the dimensions of the planet much greater on account of the relative mass of the disturbing satellites and the greater relative proportions of condensable matter that would accompany the atmospheric gases. As the angular velocity of Saturn’s rotation is about fifty-eight times greater than that of the sun, the projectiles from the planet would have a greater tendency to assume circular orbits; as the great majority of the ejections would, as in the case of the sun, be made from the vicinity of the equator, the plane of these orbits would for the most part deviate but little from that of the planet’s equator.’

In short, *Saturn should be embraced by a ring of meteorites flying round its equator in a narrow belt, or plane, and showing themselves to telescopic scrutiny exactly as the ‘Rings of Saturn’ do show themselves when powerful instruments are directed towards its face.*

The marvellously beautiful appendage of Saturn, known as its Ring, was first noticed by Galileo as far back as 1610. It must, therefore, be looked upon as one of the first fruits of the

invention of the telescope, which was only accomplished in the previous year. Galileo described what he saw as three bodies lying in a straight line and almost touching each other. For nearly half a century the two outer bodies were conceived to be handles of the central sphere, for some unguessed-at reason progressively changing their aspect and form in a period of fifteen years. In the year 1659 the Dutch astronomer, Huyghens, having constructed a telescope twelve feet long, was able by its aid to get hold of the true key of this mystery. He printed a book at the Hague which he called '*Systema Saturnii*,' in which he argued that the appendage of Saturn must be a slender flat ring, everywhere distinct from the planet's surface, and inclined to the ecliptic—'*Annulo cingitur, tenui plano, nusquam coherente, ad eclipticam inclinato*,' were the words in which he announced, at first enigmatically, this discovery.

The ring of Saturn is, it is now known, a thin flat appendage lying almost immediately in the outward prolongation of the protuberant equator of the planet, and altogether separate from it, exactly as was conceived by Huyghens; very much as if a portion of the protuberant equatorial mass had been whirled off a few thousand miles further from the axis of rotation, and had then been abandoned there to be sustained thenceforward by the force of its own rotatory movement. This curious ring is twenty-four thousand miles broad, and at the utmost 250 miles thick, and it whirls round in its own plane much as a plate does on the top of a juggler's wand, with a velocity of twenty-two thousand miles an hour; and the finest telescopes of the present day show that it is made up of a number of successive segments, with dark spaces between, and that besides this, there is within the innermost bright segment, a darker, still ring-shaped mass, extending one-third of the way across the intervening chasm that separates the brighter ring from the planet.

This inner dark ring of Saturn was seen, for the first time, almost simultaneously by Mr. Bond in America, Mr. Dawes in England, and Padre Secchi in Rome. It is of a dull slate colour, giving off only just enough light to make itself visible in contrast with the deeper black of the unilluminated sky, and it is half transparent, so that the form of the spherical body can be traced through it. Its sudden appearance in this way, at once to several observers, and the long previous period that it had remained unknown, notwithstanding the fact that the ring had been constantly under observation, and for some time with equally good instruments, seem to indicate that it may itself

possibly have been of quite modern origin, and its sudden appearance very remarkably supports a conviction long entertained by Otto Struve, that these Saturnian rings are by no means fixed and permanent in their form. This exact and most careful observer points out that Huyghens had remarked at the latter part of the 17th century, that the ring of Saturn was not quite so broad as the interval separating it from the planet, although it is now, beyond all doubt, more than twice as broad as that interval. From this, and from other independent investigations and observations of his own, Struve concludes that the ring is gradually extending itself inwards, and that if the same inward growth is continued, it should be in contact with the planet itself in another hundred and twenty years. All this, it will be observed, is radically consistent with the idea that the ring is not a solid appendage, but a moving stream of revolving meteors; erupted nodules that have been shot from the planet at some epoch of violent disturbance, and that have since continued to revolve around the planet in a sustained orbit, as the stream of the August meteors revolves around our own sun. After all that has been said in the preceding pages upon a kindred theme, there should obviously be no very grave difficulty in the assumption that Saturn, like the other great orbs of space, must have its occasional periods of exceptional eruptive activity and of subsequent repose, and that the simultaneous inner growth of the bright ring, and development of the dark ring, are intimately associated phenomena indicative of this variable energy, the dusky rings being simply the smaller and more temporary results of an agency that would have made permanent additions to the inner portions of the brighter ring if the projectile efforts had been greater. Comets of short period, which return at regular intervals to the neighbourhood of Saturn, if contemplated in this light, become merely rings, or meteor streams, which have been shot forth with a projectile energy that served to confer upon them wide elliptical orbits, in the place of close circular ones.

It will be observed that there is nothing in this view of the eruptive and meteoric parentage of comets that in any way controverts, or supersedes, what has been previously said in regard to so many of these bodies being vagrants from the outer regions of space. The stars, it will be remembered, which are spread broad-cast through those outer regions in numbers transcending human powers of computation are all suns, essentially of the same nature as the glorious luminary which emits the coronal halo and the zodiacal light. They all shine with a fierce inherent incandescence, and must be the

seat of a similar process of unceasing change and energetic activity to that which our own fountain of light and life displays. In all probability each one of those stars has therefore its own tributary array of meteor dependents. A projectile stream shot out from any one of these external systems so far that it ceased to be amenable to the reclaiming attraction of the parent mass, would of necessity travel on in the line of its projection until it plunged into the vortex of some other system, and there tracked its sky, on its way to other depths of the immensity, with a passing comet's gleam. The vagrant comets, that travel in hyperbolas, are properly the outer fringes of meteor-systems that have been torn from the parent mass by the supreme strength of their explosive impacts, and so left to their own aberrant impulses in the void. They are the projectiles of the meteoric artillery that have been shot forth into space, so to speak, *with an infinite range*.

It is scarcely possible to turn from a survey of this fascinating department of physical research without giving a parting word to a speculation that bears very closely upon it, and that has been received with a considerable degree of favour by distinguished philosophers, foremost among them Mayer of Heilbronn, Helmholtz, Joule, Sir William Thomson, and Tyndall. It does not need any large effort of imagination to conceive that the great central luminary of our system must of necessity be expending its store of energy under the unceasing strain of the marvellous work it performs, unless there is some special provision in the arrangements of the physical universe for compensating this loss, and replacing the waste. According to the authorities who have been named, this renewal of solar energy may possibly be accomplished by the mechanical impact of the meteors that are for ever showering in upon the surface of the sun from the neighbouring regions of space, and especially from those portions of it that furnish the gleams of the coronal halo, and of the zodiacal light. It has been calculated by these advocates of the 'Dynamical Theory of Heat,' that the aerolite, or solid meteor, rushing in upon the sun from an infinite distance with the velocity of 390 miles in a second, which it would acquire under such circumstances, would generate, as the mere mechanical result of the concussion, 9,000 times as much heat as would be produced by the ordinary combustion of an equal mass of coal, and that if the earth fell to the sun from an infinite distance, it would generate enough heat by the concussion to maintain the calorific waste of the sun for an entire century. The sun would consume itself under its present rate of emission of light and heat, if it were a



mass of coal burning in the ordinary way, in 4,600 years. But a mass of meteorites of equal bulk, battered in upon it, would sustain the same emission 9,000 times 4,600 years. The necessarily restricted limits of a review alone prevent a more extended notice of this interesting theory, which, at least, furnishes a noteworthy and not unphilosophical suggestion as to what may possibly be the ultimate destination of comets and meteors, and the office which these bodies perform in the organised scheme of nature.

---

Our attention has been directed to a passage in the article on the 'Physical History of the Moon,' at page 93, line 3, of our last number alluding to the process by which Newton arrived at his first confirmation of the theory of gravitation, in which there are some inaccuracies and misprints in the statement of the method of procedure. The passage may be more exactly expressed as follows:—The moon circles about the earth at a distance of sixty of its half-diameters from its centre, and therefore in a position where, if attractive force diminishes, as affirmed by theory, inversely as the square of the distance, the attraction of the earth should be 3,600 times less than it is at its surface. The moon, at its distance of sixty half-diameters, or, in exact numbers, at the mean distance of 238,000 miles, moves round in a path which may be taken as 1,500,450 miles in extent, and performs this journey in 39,343 minutes, at an average rate of about  $38\frac{1}{2}$  miles per minute. But in  $38\frac{1}{2}$  miles the moon moves in such a circle through a curve that falls out of a straight line as much as  $16\frac{1}{2}$  feet, which is also exactly what a stone falls through in a second under the earth's attraction when 3,959, or a mean semi-diameter of the earth, away from its centre. The moon at 60 times 3,959 miles falls through 3,600 times less space in a second than it would on the earth's surface, that is it falls through the 0.0536th part of an inch; which is virtually the same thing as 193 inches, or  $16\frac{1}{2}$  feet, in a minute;—0.0536 of an inch multiplied by 3,600 being equal to 192.9600, or very nearly 193 inches. The moon, in this calculation, is considered to be travelling in a circle with its mean distance for a radius instead of in its actually elliptical orbit.

In lines 18, 19, and 31 of page 93 a decimal point was accidentally omitted in the figures 419; it was intended to be 41.9; but the exact velocity of the moon in its orbit, if estimated as an average from its mean distance, instead of in round numbers, is  $38\frac{1}{2}$  miles per minute.

- ART. VI.—1. *A Bill intituled 'An Act to provide for the Revision and Amendment of the Rubrics contained in the Book of Common Prayer.'* Presented to the House of Lords by the Lord Bishop of LONDON, June 19, 1874.
2. *Synodalia, Journal and Chronicle of the Convocation for the Province of Canterbury.* London: 1854–1874.
3. *Parliamentary Debates on Public Worship Regulation Bill,* 1874.

THE recent debates in Parliament on the Act for the Regulation of Public Worship revealed a spirit and a resolution at once refreshing and unexpected. Whatever men's views have been as to the real convictions of the country on ecclesiastical affairs, hardly anyone was prepared for the eager unanimity with which the Archbishop's Bill was taken up in the House of Commons, and carried through all its stages; the Government, at first reluctant, being drawn into hearty support, and pressing measures like the Judicature Bill being sacrificed for the one measure which had come to be of supreme importance.

The meaning of those debates was rightly summed up by Sir William Harcourt as a conviction, first, that the National Church must be upheld, and, secondly, that this could only be done by maintaining its Protestant character. But it is not Protestantism in its merely negative aspect which has inspired the new attitude of Parliament. It is the historical Protestantism of the nation, the conviction that religion is a matter of public and national concern. It is the determination that the Church shall be not in name but in reality national, and that the clergy shall obey the law framed by the will of the whole nation. Those who have watched with anxiety the course of ecclesiastical affairs during the last few years can hardly have failed to observe that the Church-organisation was drifting away from its national position. It was not merely that Ritualists were defying the convictions and common sense of their fellow-countrymen, and casting a slur upon the Reformation; nor even that the apparent impotence of the law enabled them to give the Church system the aspect of a mere engine for the promotion of Romanism; but, still more, that the clerical or sacerdotal views, of which Ritualism is but one expression, which would leave all matters of religion to the exclusive conduct of the clergy, had gained an undue predominance; and, further, that Parliament, the only body which could maintain the national as opposed to the clerical organisation, seemed to have abdicated its functions, and to be more and more unwilling to

touch religious questions. This probably was due in part to the supposition that the political Nonconformists who aimed at Disestablishment were the strongest support of the Liberal party then in power, and partly to a belief that the sacerdotal theories of an influential fraction of the clergy had a serious hold upon the laity of the Church. Both of these suppositions have been shown to be erroneous. We are convinced that the laity generally, while respecting the good done by many of the High Church clergy and welcoming a development of church art and music in the services, have no sympathy with theories of the divine right of the clergy, such as those lately expressed in the House of Lords by the Bishop of Lincoln and by the Bishop of Winchester. And similarly we believe that the country, while honouring the sturdy principle of the Nonconformist leaders, is quite unprepared to follow them in giving effect to their theory of a separation of religious affairs from the general affairs of the nation, and that the only thing which could persuade it to destroy its Church Establishment would be the conviction that the Church was being hopelessly driven into an anti-national position. We hail, therefore, the recent action of Parliament as a confirmation of our convictions. We believe that it has acted as a revelation to the country, which makes it conscious of its unity and its power, and which indicates the direction towards which its policy should turn.

It was pointed out that the Act for the Regulation of Public Worship could not stand alone; and neither the distinguished person who had charge of the bill in the House of Commons, nor those who supported him announced any doctrine of finality. On the contrary, it was assumed on all sides that what was done this year was but the prelude to further legislation. We venture, indeed, to think that the promise which seemed to be made to treat all clerical offences in the same manner is of very doubtful policy. The moral offences of the clergy belong to the criminal class, and should, we submit, after a preliminary investigation, be tried by the ordinary procedure of the Common Law. For offences of a doctrinal kind, on the other hand, the present cumbrous machinery, which gives many opportunities of reconsideration, is not ill-suited. But matters of Ritual should be treated mainly as administrative details; and for this purpose the law must be made absolutely plain.

We are quite aware that it is impossible to enforce a rigid uniformity in every detail for every church in the country. But what is possible is, first, to make the law unambiguous on all points in which uniformity is to be observed; secondly, to

prescribe distinctly what is to be left to discretion; and, thirdly, to define with equal distinctness the authority to which the discretion is committed. We regard the discretion lodged by the Act of this year in the hands of the Bishops, of refusing to allow ritual suits to proceed, as an *Interim*, which is intended to last only till the law is made perfectly clear on the points we have specified. To this task the Church and country have now to apply themselves.

It is to Parliament that we must look for the settlement of the whole question; and we must hope that this responsibility will be accepted fully, and not thrown upon others. It is natural that, on the first view of the matter, politicians should turn to the Convocations of the clergy and expect some valuable aid from them. It may be thought that the Convocations have some power to settle these questions, and even that Parliament is precluded from legislating on such matters without their consent. But a review of the history of the Convocations of Canterbury and of York will show how unfounded are any such suppositions, and how mischievous would be the policy which should invest the Convocations with new powers.

This subject has gained much in importance from the bill introduced at the end of last session by the Bishop of London, entitled 'An Act to provide for the Revision and Amendment of the Rubrics contained in the Book of Common Prayer.' This bill provides that the Archbishops, as Presidents, and the Bishops and clergy of the Convocations shall have power from time to time to prepare schemes for the amendment of the Rubrics: that such schemes, when certified under the hand and seal of both Archbishops, shall be laid before the Queen in Council, and be published in the Gazette and laid before both Houses of Parliament; and that, unless an address be presented by either of the Houses of Parliament within forty days praying Her Majesty to withhold her consent, the scheme may then be approved in Council; and that schemes so approved shall become law as if they were part of this Act. The Convocations would thus be erected into a department with power to frame Orders in Council. Of this proposal, though it emanates from a Prelate whose sober judgment might be expected to incur the charge of timidity rather than of rashness, it is not too much to say that it is a revolutionary measure of the most retrograde character. It is revolutionary because it proposes to give the Convocations a position which they have never before held, to transfer to them practically the whole power over the conduct of divine service. And it is retrograde because that power would certainly be used in the

interests not of the nation but of a class. It is clear that the bill takes the initiative out of the hands of Parliament. Its result must be, and we presume its intention is, not merely that some kind of initiative shall be given to the Convocations, but that no other body but the Convocations shall have the initiative. That is, at the moment when it has become imperative to deal with the Rubrics, it is proposed that all hope of an effective reform shall be stopped by erecting into prominence a body the tendency of which has always been anti-national and obstructive.

That such a measure should emanate from such a quarter is an indication of the need which exists for a presentation of the facts relating to the Convocations such as will enable the reader to judge of their true position and tendency. We shall show that it is unnecessary according to constitutional precedent to consult the Convocations in making changes in the Public Services of the Church; that the constitution of these bodies makes them unfit for the purpose; that it is contrary to the true principles applicable to these subjects to acknowledge such a power as would be thus attributed to them; and that their practical working has proved that nothing but harm can be expected from a measure which would give them the control.

1. It was said by Burke that the Convocations were a part of the Constitution, but that they had nothing but a legal existence. They had not at that time met for the transaction of business for more than sixty years. There are parts of every organism which are more vital than others; and we must look to history in order to see whether an institution has practically made good its position. There is a certain truth in Carlyle's paradox of 'the mights' being more important than the rights, and it is this, that the claims of an institution, if they are sound, will in the course of history establish themselves till it becomes a living power. The history of the Convocations shows no such vitality. It was sought by Atterbury to vindicate for them the title of a Spiritual Parliament; and their advocates have claimed for them at times a power to initiate or to supervise all laws relating to spiritual things. But these claims have never been admitted by the nation. It would be most in accordance with the facts of history to say that they are the councils of the Archbishops, which may be consulted or not, as may at any time be found convenient.

It was rightly said by Lord Hardwicke in his well-known judgment on the powers of Convocation, that little was to be gained by a study of the councils of Norman and Saxon times, because the clergy then frequently sat in the general council

of the nation. In the great constitutional changes of the time of Edward I., which gave a more definite form to the Conventions as well as to Parliament, it is evident that the attempt was made to bring the representatives of the clergy to sit in Parliament. This was successfully resisted by the clerical body, but the traces of it remain to the present day in the form, nearly six hundred years old, of the writs which summon the Bishops to Parliament. It is those writs, addressed to them as Peers of Parliament, and not the Convocation writs, which contain the *Præmunientes* clause, by which the representation of the clergy is settled. The clergy having chosen to separate their interests from those of the realm, the King nevertheless retained the right of summoning them, which was exercised by a writ directed to the Archbishop alone, in the form still used. The Conventions became a separate power, the action of which was jealously watched by the King and Parliament. The Conventions were necessary for taxing purposes; and the writ of Edward I., which we have alluded to, which gave Convocation its present form, bears witness to this, for the special object assigned for their meeting at that time is to help the King in the recovery of Gascony from the King of France. Thus the power of the purse was in the hands of the Conventions as truly as in those of the House of Commons; and it remained with them for nearly four centuries. The clergy were, during the early part of that period, a wealthy and powerful body; they were supported also, in any conflict with the King, by the formidable power of the Pope; and had there been any necessity in the nature of things for the existence of a 'Spiritual Parliament,' there is no reason why they should not have made good their position. The Conventions started fair by the side of the House of Commons. Yet the Commons have grown year by year throughout our history, while the Conventions have had but a shadowy existence. The taxing power in their hands proved a source of weakness rather than of strength; on the single occasion on which it was used effectively, it was used with disastrous results. The benevolence granted in 1640 to the King, then on the verge of his conflict with the Parliament, became, in conjunction with the canons then promulgated, the means of separating the clergy definitively from the interests of the nation, and was one chief cause of the downfall of the Church-system. And when, in 1664, the separate taxation of the clergy was given up by an arrangement between Lord Clarendon and Archbishop Sheldon, the change—which Bishop Gibson called the greatest change ever made in the Constitution—was made, not by Canon, but by

Statute, without any reluctance on the part of the clergy. But the change thus silently effected undoubtedly took away from the Convocations the chief constitutional ground for their existence. 'It was found,' says Dr. Cardwell, in allusion to this change, 'that Convocations were an empty pageant;' and he goes on to point out that they were of no value to the Government, that they were regarded with some degree of jealousy by the Bishops, and that it was only fears of possible dangers 'that made any party desire that Convocations should 'still maintain a decent and determinate existence.'

Putting aside then the taxing power which alone gave the Convocations the position which they hold as attached to Parliament, and summoned at every meeting of Parliament, they remain as Synods, but as Synods subject to the peculiar circumstances of England, a country in which Church affairs have never been separated from those of the nation. They are the councils of the Metropolitan; and, under the supreme national authority, are entirely under his control. The Royal writ is addressed to him alone; he fixes the days of meeting, and can prorogue, as is believed by the best authorities, even without the consent of his suffragans. He can prescribe what business shall be entered upon, and the order in which it shall be transacted; without his permission no member can absent himself; and he has a veto upon all that is done. Accordingly, the acts of the Convocations often run in the name of the Archbishop alone, or in the name of the Archbishop and their suffragans, without mention of the other clergy. And in the most important of the Acts of Uniformity, that of the first year of Elizabeth, the consent of the Metropolitan alone was made necessary for the exercise of the Royal prerogative in altering the services. When to this we add that the Archbishop and Bishops have a far more effective sphere of action in Parliament, it is clear that the objects of Convocations are much narrowed, and their meeting may well be thought to be superfluous.

There is no time at which the Crown as representing the nation has not claimed and exercised a right of intervention in the assemblies of the clergy, and of acting independently of them. The chronicler who records the important synodical acts of Archbishop Peckham, in 1281, a little before the establishment of the regular Convocations, describes the council in these words:—

'The Archbishop of Canterbury having called together (convocatis) all the bishops, &c., &c., of his province, held a solemn council at Lambeth, in which he renewed the constitutions of Otto and of Othobon.

In the same council he had proposed to annul certain liberties which belonged to our lord the king, and had been exercised from far-distant times, namely, the oversight of the right of patronage, and the royal prohibition in certain matters which appeared to concern the spirituality alone. But the king opposed himself publicly to him through certain of his own people, and with threats inhibited him from presuming to establish anything to the prejudice or depression of the king's liberty. Whence it came to pass that the Archbishop, being terrified, started back from his presumption.'

On the other hand, when statutes like those of *Præmunire* and *Provisors* were to be passed, the King and Parliament went their way without reference to the assemblies of the clergy.

Thus, during the times of the concurrent legislative power, there was perpetual liability to collision; no definite line was drawn between matters within the cognisance of Parliament and matters belonging to the clergy; and the King and Parliament never hesitated as to their course in any case in which the general rights of the nation were concerned. But at last the crisis came in the great business of the divorce of Henry VIII. (a purely 'spiritual' matter), and in the settlement of that great affair the nation knew that it was settling its own affairs also. The first Statute of Appeals (24 Hen. VIII. c. 12) determined that all causes, secular and spiritual alike, should be decided at home, none being sent to Rome. It was very far from granting, as has sometimes been hastily assumed from the language of its preamble, any limitation upon the powers of Parliament, for it assumed power to allow the Bishops and clergy to minister the Sacraments and Divine Services, notwithstanding inhibitions from Rome, then generally held to be binding; but it left for the moment the conflict of spiritual and secular jurisdictions within the realm, while asserting its own authority over both. This, however, was but the beginning of the movement. The question whether the nation was to be supreme over the clergy, both in legislative and in judicial matters, remained to be decided, and was decided the very next year. The petition of the Commons, which led to the submission of the clergy, declared that the acts of the clergy in their convocations constantly interfered with the rights of the King and his subjects, and subjected them to excommunication and the guilt of heresy. The petition or complaint, which had evidently the King's approval, was sent down to Convocation, and the Clergy, after a long negotiation, finally gave way. The Act of Parliament which embodies their submission establishes incontestably the supreme power of the nation as represented in Parliament over the whole



clerical system. It does not merely record the promise of the clergy not to do the things complained of, but *enacts* that they shall not meet without the King's authority, that they shall not make canons without his consent, nor promulge them without his sanction. The words used leave no room for any independent power. The authority of Parliament is vindicated as supreme in all departments. And in the matter of appeals the supremacy of the nation over the clergy is equally vindicated. The Ecclesiastical Courts are recognised; but from their law, as from an exotic system, like the Admiralty law, an appeal is given to the King in Chancery. And further, to prevent the interference of clergy-made law with that of the nation, a commission was appointed of thirty-two persons (all to be selected by the King) to review the canons then in existence; and power was given to the King to re-enact under his great seal all that they approved, the remainder being summarily abolished.

It is difficult in reading this statute to avoid the conviction that the intention of Parliament was to take all real power away from the Convocations. We see in it the uprising of a spirit which goes far beyond the limitation of the Convocations to a particular sphere of action. The whole range of their possible powers is touched, and in no part of it does there appear to be space left to them for action or useful movement. And, as a matter of history, their action, except in the way of obstruction or retrogression, has been hardly felt at all in the life of the English Church. All the beneficent reforms of the Reformation, of the Revolution, and of the present century have been made either in spite of them or with their reluctant consent. Not one has been originated by them and carried through by their power.

For this there were several causes, the chief of which was the impossibility, in a compact community like that of England, of separating one department of life from the rest; and on this we shall have to touch further on. Another cause was the comparative poverty of the clergy after the Reformation, which made their subsidies of far less value. Another was the unbounded extent of the Sovereign's supremacy, exercised in the time of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. through the Council, and from Elizabeth's accession to the Rebellion by the Courts of High Commission, who undertook not only judicial and administrative, but legislative functions, as in the case of the memorable Advertisements of 1565.

But within their own sphere, that of religion, the clergy were now no longer supreme. The laity, among whom the Reforma-

tion had its greatest influence, began to rise to their true position in questions of public worship and religious teaching. The royal supremacy was regarded not as the super-position of a *mixta persona* over a double body, the moieties of which were to act separately under him, but as the assertion of the ultimate supremacy of the lay power in all matters. In the Act 37 Henry VIII. c. 17, for allowing lay and married persons to be ecclesiastical judges, the preamble states that the rules against such appointments had been introduced by the adherents of the Bishop of Rome, 'which, standing in their effects, did sound to 'appear . . . to be directly repugnant to your Majesty, as 'supreme head of the Church, your Grace being a layman.' The laity, in fact, being better instructed, and aroused to an interest in religious matters, began to hold strong opinions, and to assert them in the House of Commons, in matters in which a few years before they would have felt their own incompetence. It was stipulated in the Act of Submission that of the commission who should revise the canons one-half should be laymen; and the legislation of the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. dealt boldly with all matters of doctrine and of worship. In Elizabeth's time, though the Queen sent messages to the Commons showing her displeasure at their dealing with questions of doctrine, they persevered and passed the Act for Ministers to be of sound Religion; and on a later occasion, in 1585, we find Archbishop Whitgift complaining to the Queen that, 'notwithstanding the late charge given by your 'Highness to the Lower House of Parliament for dealing with 'causes of the Church, yet they have passed a bill in that 'House touching that matter'—a matter which was nothing less than a proposal that the competence of all clergymen appointed to benefices should be tried by twelve laymen. In King James's time the Commons protested against the canons then passed, and nearly overthrew them; and in 1640 they asserted that no such canons had any validity unless confirmed by Parliament. This temper of the House of Commons has been maintained throughout our subsequent history, except in times of torpor; and we are probably now witnessing a revival of it which is pregnant with consequences. For while the 'omnipotence of Parliament' is at work, it is very unlikely that any other legislative machine should attempt to operate.

With these various causes drawing away the jurisdiction which might have been exercised by the Convocations, there was little room for their action. They had no initiative; it was competent for those with whom the initiative rested to consult them or not as they pleased. And they were accord-

ingly consulted only when it was thought safe to do so, and when their assent might facilitate the reception of a measure. 'Several matters,' says Mr. Lathbury in his 'History of Convocation,' written with the avowed object of showing its importance, 'which tended to advance the Reformation, were executed 'by the King himself without consulting the Convocation;' and he might have used much more emphatic terms. When Henry VIII. received power to exercise the supremacy, and to repress all heresies and offences, to suppress monasteries, to appoint a Vicar-General for ecclesiastical affairs who was to take his place even at the Convocation above that of the Archbishop, he obtained these powers from Parliament alone. The Primer which contained the rudiments of the Book of Common Prayer was issued by the King alone. When the Convocations in 1542 would have thwarted the publication of Cranmer's Bible, having first petitioned for a revision (how near a parallel have we had to this in later years!), the matter was at once taken out of their hands and referred to the Universities, and the Convocation was dissolved. On the other hand, when the retrograde Act of the Six Articles was framed, the authority of Convocation was invoked, not in vain, the ungrateful task being committed to Cromwell, the Vicar-General, of putting the questions to the Lower House of the clergy and eliciting their too ready reply.

The practice was the same in Edward VI.'s reign. Two very important steps were taken on his accession before either Parliament or Convocation could meet: the publication of the Book of Homilies, and the issue of the Injunctions which established the Reformation in all outward respects. When Parliament met it proceeded at once to the affairs of religion. There is reason to think that the proposal that the Communion should be administered in both kinds was accepted in the Convocation through Cranmer's influence, and that something was said there favourable to the repeal of the Act of the Six Articles. But in the Acts of Parliament effecting these changes there is no mention of Convocation, and its assent, if given, was not thought worth mentioning in the proclamation enforcing the Act for the Sacrament, though the advice of the Protector and the Council and that of the Archbishop are recorded. The chief anxiety of the Convocation seems to have been that the revision of the canons, the work of the Commission for Church services, and generally the proposed laws relating to religion, should be laid before them. But there is little reason to think that their wish was granted in any particular. It seems more likely that their demand for an over-

sight of all legislation touching religion appeared so extravagant that they were less consulted than before. It is certain that the most important part of the Liturgy, the Communion Office, was completed and published when Convocation was not sitting; and this gives a strong presumption that the First Prayer-book was not submitted to that body. The Ordinal, the Catechism, and the Act for the appointment of bishops which gave the nomination absolutely to the King, were set forth without any authority of Convocation. The records, indeed, of the Convocation of this period were destroyed in the Fire of London, and we have but side-lights to guide us. It can only be said that, if Convocation was consulted at all in these changes, its assent was thought so little necessary that it never appears on the face of the documents. But of the Acts of the last year of Edward we may speak more certainly. The Second Prayer-book, which is in all substantial respects that which we now use, was certainly not submitted to Convocation. 'It was not 'permitted,' says Cardwell, 'to pass its judgment upon the 'Second Service-book put forth by authority of Parliament; 'and for this plain reason, that it would have thrown all 'possible difficulties in the way of its publication.' This book contained the new rubric on the ornaments of the Church and its ministers, the rubric about kneeling at the Communion, and the Ordinal, and may be said to mark the consummation of the Reformation. There is a dispute as to the Articles of religion, which, as originally set forth along with Poynt's Catechism, bore the singular title (differing greatly from the description of documents sanctioned by Convocation, e.g. of the Thirty-nine Articles in 1562) 'De quibus in Synodo Londinensi inter 'Episcopos et alios eruditos viros convenerat.' It was admitted the next year, both in Convocation and in Cranmer's examination at Oxford, that Poynt's Catechism had received no sanction from Convocation; and Heylin, who had opportunities of searching the registers which still existed in his time, found no trace of the Articles there. It is therefore probable (as Heylin himself concludes) that their sanction by a committee of the Bishops was held to be the sanction of a Synod of sufficient authority.

In Elizabeth's time it was the same, though the Queen showed a disposition to thwart the independence of the Commons in matters of religion, and to act through the clergy alone as more amenable to her prerogative. The great Acts which re-established the Reformation at the beginning of her reign, restoring the whole power over religion to the Crown, were passed without any consultation with the Convocations; and the

dealing of the Queen and Parliament with the all-important question of public worship was decisive on the question we are treating. The Queen came to the throne in November 1558. In December she issued a proclamation ordering that the Litany, the Epistles and Gospels, and the Ten Commandments should be read in English. At the end of January Parliament met; the Commons at once (February 15th), sent up a bill on the new service book, but it was kept back—first, in order that a Commission which had been appointed to confer upon the changes in the service might report; and secondly, that a Conference might take place in Westminster Abbey, at which it is especially noted that the whole House of Commons was present. The Convocation meanwhile met, but were at once inhibited from making any canon. They precluded themselves from all influence by passing resolutions affirming the Roman view of the Sacrament, the supremacy of the Pope, and the sole power of the clergy to treat of matters of doctrine, the Sacraments, and the order of Divine Service. Meanwhile the Conference at the Abbey took place at the end of March, and by April 18th, the Commons sent up a new bill on Public Worship, which was passed by the Lords April 25th, all the Bishops dissenting. Thus the crowning act of the Reformation was done not only without Convocation, but against the expressed conviction of Convocation. The clergy came round afterwards; but it was the nation, not the clergy, that led the way. It is true that for matters of doctrine it was provided (1 Eliz. c. 36), that nothing should be adjudged to be heresy by the High Commission but what should be determined to be heresy by Parliament with assent of the clergy in their Convocations; and that three years afterwards the clergy were induced to ratify the Thirty-nine Articles of religion. But the recognition of the clerical assemblies was merely of a negative kind; and the assent of Convocation to the Articles was not procured till the whole bench of Bishops had been filled with Reformers, and the whole body of the clergy purged and brought into submission by means of the Oath of Supremacy enacted by Parliament, and the Injunctions and the Commission which rested on lay authority. The Advertisements, which followed in 1565, (issued by the Commissioners without special authorisation of the Queen, but enforced and reckoned valid throughout Elizabeth's reign,) settled the question of ornaments, which the Act of Uniformity had left to be decided by the Queen: and the settlement made by them, that with the exception of the cope at the Sacrament in cathedrals and collegiate churches, the

clergy should wear surplices in all their ministrations, was adopted in the canons of 1603 as the recognised practice.

From the issue of these Advertisements no changes took place in Elizabeth's reign. On the accession of James, the petition of the thousand ministers remonstrating against certain points in the Prayer-book and the Hampton Court Conference which followed it led to a few alterations in the Prayer-book, the chief of which were the addition of the Thanksgivings after the Litany, and of the part of the Catechism relating to the Sacraments. The Prayer-book thus altered by the King and the bishops, was set forth and enforced by royal proclamation alone; and the greatest work of King James's reign, the Revised Translation of the Bible, was also effected by the King's authority alone.

The Book of Canons, framed in 1603-4, is the one instance in which some kind of legal validity appears to have been given by the act of the Convocations alone. What amount of validity this is it is very difficult to ascertain; nor does there seem to be any good reason why they should be esteemed more valid than those of 1640, which are universally repudiated. The one point legally ascertained is that they do not bind the laity; and yet it is equally certain that they profess to do so, in such matters, for instance, as those of marriage or the enforcement of church-rates for particular things, the execution of which they entrust with the confident tone of peremptory laws to the High Commissioners. 'They were collected,' says Collier, 'by Bishop Bancroft out of the Articles, Injunctions, and 'Synodical Acts passed and published in the reign of King 'Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth;' and their chief importance is as evidence of what was at that time understood to be the law. The House of Commons opposed them, refusing a conference with members of Convocation as derogatory to their privileges, and the next year passed a bill (which was cut short only by a dissolution), declaring that no such canons could touch the laity. Many of the canons have become obsolete, many have been rendered invalid as opposed to subsequent Acts of Parliament, and many relate to insignificant matters usually left to the discretion of the clergy; and the penalties to which they appeal are those of excommunication, for which there has never been so much as a mode of procedure in the reformed Church of England; so that their validity has hardly been fully tested as binding upon the clergy, and they cannot be cited as showing any power of legislation in the Convocation even in those matters (if such there be) which concern the

clergy alone. But this attempt at legislation, coupled with the high sacerdotal theories of Bancroft who now became archbishop, served to alarm the country, and was one of the causes which led first to civil war and then to the prevalence and bitterness of Dissent. 'They added greatly,' says Cardwell, 'to the causes of disquiet which already existed in the Church of England. Up to this time the cause of the Church was ably and successfully maintained; from this period it sensibly and constantly declined.'

We need not trace that decline and fall; the infatuation of the Church rulers which led the King beyond his powers and his rights; the canons of 1606 which pledged the clergy to the extreme theories of Divine Right; the Declaration prefixed to and still published with the Articles, which tried to give powers to Convocation, and was promptly met by a counter-declaration of the Commons; the defiant canons of 1640, which amid the beginnings of the earthquake tried by the famous Etcetera Oath to bind the Church to a figment of immutability; the illegal subsidy which was designed to help the King to govern without his Parliament; and the final collapse under which the very names of Episcopacy and the Liturgy became objects of hatred to the nation. For our present purpose, that of constructive legislation, the period from 1603 to 1661 is a blank in our annals, and we pass to the important Convocation of the Restoration.

The work of the Convocation of 1661 and the following year is contained in the Prayer-book now in use, which has not been changed since that time. It was reckoned by Archbishop Tenison that the alterations then made by Convocation amounted to 600; but they were mostly of a slight character, and the reproach which attaches to that Convocation is, that it gave no help in the main difficulty, that is, in bringing about the reconciliation which was the first promise of the Restoration, but occupied itself wholly with minor details. The Parliament watched its proceedings with some jealousy; it is thought by some persons that the House of Lords made some alterations in the book; and the House of Commons, on receiving the amended book, scrutinised it through a Committee and then asserted their rights as follows:—The question was put, 'Whether debate shall be admitted to the amendments made by Convocation in the Book of Common Prayer and sent down by the Lords to this House?' This was resolved in the negative, but only by a majority of six, ninety-six to ninety. The question was then put, 'That the amendments made by the Convocation and sent down by the Lords to this

‘ House might, by the order of this House, have been debated,’ and this was affirmed without a division. The Parliament further, in the Act for the reinstatement of the Ecclesiastical Courts, expressly guarded themselves against giving any sanction to the supposed power of Convocations to make laws. Nothing in this statute, it is enacted, shall ‘ confirm the canons ‘ made in the year 1640, or any of them, nor any other ecclesiastical laws or canons not formerly confirmed, allowed, or ‘ enacted by Parliament, or by the established laws of the land ‘ as they stood in the year 1639.’

On one more occasion the Government committed an important measure to the discretion of Convocation, and they may well have repented of having entrusted it with power. In 1689 the opportunity which had been lost in 1661–2 of doing something for the general welfare of the nation was again offered to Convocation. Parliament in that year passed the great Toleration Act without consulting the clerical bodies; but when the Bill for Comprehension had been passed by the House of Lords, the Commons were induced, mainly no doubt by the professions of amity between the Church and the Nonconformists during their common danger in the time of James II., to propose to the King that a Convocation should be called according to ancient usage to deliberate upon ecclesiastical affairs. It was a fatal step for the cause of Christian charity and for the objects which the Government had at heart. There was a chance that, in the fervour of Protestantism which had been awakened the mass of the Nonconformists might have come within the widened embrace of the National Church. A Royal Commission was appointed, which, under the guidance of Tillotson and Burnet, proposed many judicious changes, of which at the present day the features which strike us are their extreme moderation, and the ingenuity with which the difficulties of a century of controversy and war were overcome. The greatest difficulty, that of the necessity of Episcopal ordination, was surmounted by a conditional form: ‘ If thou art not ‘ ordained, I ordain thee; ’ the objection to the surplice and to the cross in baptism was to be allowed, the bishop having power to appoint a curate to officiate for the objecting incumbent; the subscriptions were to be reduced to a single and simple form; the Athanasian Creed was to be recited fewer times and an explanation to be added; the form of ordination and absolution was to be modified; the Apocryphal Lessons were to be expunged, and additions made to the Catechism and to several of the services. We do not believe, with Macaulay, that these changes would have alienated the Conservatives and country



gentlemen ; for they are changes which would not strike the eye of the careless so much as respond to the scruples of the thoughtful ; and we may safely say, that the sympathies of the Dissenters would have been won by the enactment of such a measure, even if it had failed to incorporate them in the Church. But the Convocation when it met would not even go to work ; they showed a temper of sullen resistance ; and the Government having taken the false step of consulting them, were unable to proceed with the bill. Thus the Convocation gave a full proof which has been confirmed by the experience of other times, that if it has little power to originate it has great power to obstruct. It can perpetuate religious discord ; it has no power to heal it. It will at times accede to good measures if it is made clear that the Government intend to carry them through ; but as soon as substantial power is given it, all hope of improvement ceases.

Of the subsequent history of the Convocations till the present day there is very little to say, except that it demonstrates what we have just said of their tendencies. From 1662 to 1700, with the one exception just mentioned, Convocation was not allowed to meet except as a matter of form. It had then seventeen years of feverish existence, only a little less time than that occupied by its present revival, and was then laid aside for 135 years. During its revival at the beginning of the eighteenth century every effort was made to endow it with life. The ' Letter to a Convocation Man ' stirred the country for the time, and one of the most animated controversies ever known was that in which Atterbury boldly challenged for the Lower House of Convocation the privileges of a Spiritual Parliament. The works of Wake, of Gibson, and of Hody, and the numerous pamphlets accompanying them, fairly exhaust the subject as a field for literature, as do the conflicts of the Upper and Lower House as a field of practical action. In looking back upon it we see how hopeless was the task of assigning to the Convocations any real functions in the English Commonwealth. Even in those last glorious years of Queen Anne (as they appeared to the Tories and High Churchmen of the time), when Mrs. Masham was supreme and English policy was represented by the Treaty of Utrecht, when Sacheverell was a great divine, and Harley and Bolingbroke, champions of the Church, after triumphing over occasional conformity, could play into the hands of Atterbury and his friends in the Convocation, and when the majority of the judges even declared in favour of the judicial powers of Convocation, Convocation was as impotent for good as it had been in its worst depression. Their year's work is represented by the letters of business of

1713, which direct them to consult on proceedings in cases of excommunication (a function which was really non-existent), on forms for visiting prisoners (which might well be deemed a matter beyond the reach of forms), on the establishment of Rural Deans where they did not exist, on preserving Terriers of Glebes, and on regulating licenses of marriage. It is no wonder that with such programmes before them they should have enlivened their meetings with controversy, and that the range of their strictures should extend from Toland's Deism, through Whiston, Clarke, and Hoadly, to the pious liberalism of Burnet. Nor is it any wonder that the doors of Convocation should have been closed with the universal acquiescence of the nation, and remained closed for 135 years. But it is a matter for wonder that at the end of that period it should have been thought a wise measure to revive it; and it is also a matter of wonder that it should now, when Church-reforms are talked of, be thought possible to make use of Convocation to effect them.

The Church-reforms of the present century, and they are not few or unimportant, have been effected in all but very few instances without any regard to Convocation, whether before or since its revival. The Pluralities Act, the Church Discipline Act, the Church Building Acts, the salutary measures for dealing with Church property through the Ecclesiastical Commission, were passed during the abeyance of Convocation; but we may be quite sure that they would have been hindered rather than facilitated had Convocation been sitting. Since the revival, University Tests have been abolished, the Political Services expunged from the Prayer-book, clerical disabilities removed, facilities for public worship given, the law of Dilapidations settled, by Parliamentary action alone without any reference to the Convocations.

If we here look back over this review of the past, what are the results, especially in reference to Public Worship? Convocation has been consulted when it was thought that its intervention might be of use; but no distinct rights have ever been recognised as belonging to it; its action has always been feeble, and whenever power has been given to it, it has been retrograde and hurtful. There have been since the beginning of the Reformation six editions, so to call them, of the Book of Common Prayer, of which the account is as follows. 1. The Primer and English Services of Henry VIII.'s time were prepared and put forth by the King alone. 2. The First Prayer-book of Edward VI. (1548) was prepared by a Commission, and set forth by Royal authority, but may possibly

have had some sanction from Convocation. 3. The Second Prayer-book of Edward VI. (1552) was prepared by a Commission, and set forth by Act of Parliament, and not submitted to Convocation. 4. The Prayer-book of Elizabeth was prepared by a Commission, and set forth by Act of Parliament, against the protest of Convocation and the Bishops. 5. The Prayer-book of James was prepared by a Commission and set forth by Royal Proclamation alone. 6. The Prayer-book of the Restoration was prepared by a Commission and by Convocation, and enforced by Act of Parliament. To which we may add the beneficial proposals of 1689, which were thwarted by Convocation. If even the ultra Royalist and High Church Parliament of the Restoration asserted its power to override the decisions of Convocation, though it forbore to exercise that power, there can certainly be no reason for those who are redressing the wrongs done by that Parliament to submit their discretion to the judgment of the clerical body.

2. The causes of the feebleness of the Convocations are inherent in their constitution. They are the assemblies of the clergy alone. But the laity are the body of the Church, and the clergy its ministers or officials. In dealing with matters of legislation and government we venture to think that the common principles of political life are those which must be applied. If there is a consecration of the ministers which dignifies their official administration, there is also a consecration of the whole Church which dignifies popular rights. It was a significant mode of expression by which the early Latin Churches spoke of the laity as the Plebs; and with our modern experience becomes still more so. Who would think, in dealing with any other organisation, of entrusting all power to the paid officials, or of giving them a veto on all measures? Would Parliament ever subject a bill on medical diplomas to the discretion of the present practitioners? In what position would army reform or army purchase be if the wishes of the officers had been allowed full sway? Did Parliament stop the Judicature Bill when the Chancery Bar petitioned against the fusion of Law and Equity, or refrain from requiring the Judges to try Election petitions because they unanimously begged to decline the task? And yet in the Church the case is far stronger; for the interest of the laity in Church matters is constant, not occasional, and the part they are bound to take is not passive but active. It is impossible to separate the interests of the clergy from those of the laity, or those of the Church from those of the nation.

There are three things in the structure of the Convocations

which cause their incompetence as a legislative machine. The first of these is that they are not national but provincial. We are apt to speak of 'Convocation' as though it were a single body. But the Synod of York has to be consulted in all cases in which real action has to be taken. There is a well-known story of a council in the Middle Ages, which was broken up by a contention between the two archbishops for precedence. The Archbishop of York finding his brother primate already in the president's chair, and being unwilling to yield him the place of honour, sat down upon his lap, and being a portly person, eclipsed and nearly crushed him. The difficulty was settled by an uprising of the more numerous provincials of Canterbury, and by the Primate of York being borne away from the assembly in the arms of his suffragans. If it is difficult for two presidents to occupy one chair, it is also difficult for two assemblies to occupy the same ground. In early days the Sovereign occasionally overrode the rights of the Convocation of York. The canons of 1597 which had been debated only in Canterbury were made binding by the Queen in York as well; the same was the case with those of 1603, though the Convocation of York was afterwards allowed to pass identical canons for itself; and in 1661 pressure was put upon the Northern Convocation to send delegates to London whose consent to the deliberations of their southern brethren was to bind the whole province of York. But except in rare cases the double action of the Convocations would make legislation all but impossible; and in late attempts at the passing of canons this has proved a fatal hindrance.

A second difficulty lies in the relations of the Upper and Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury. The Lower House has no initiative except by means of addresses which it may present to the Upper House. Its business is controlled by the Archbishop, and its debates constantly cut short by his interposition. It retains, in fact, the form of its original constitution, in which, having met as one House with the Bishops, it was desired to retire while the Bishops deliberated, and was ordered to consider certain things during its retirement on which the President desired its opinion. It is merely fitted for a Consultative Committee, not for an independent and deliberative body. But it has a determining voice in all that is done. The Upper House being much more amenable to public opinion, is more capable of passing good measures. But for all purposes of action or inaction the common estimate is true which means by 'Convocation' the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury.

A third hindrance is that Convocation does not represent the Church. We tremble, while we say this, at the penalties denounced by the 139th canon against the man who denies the Convocation to be the true Church of England by representation, viz. excommunication, until he repents of this his wicked error. But we trust that the 'Edinburgh Review' may claim the benefit of Lord Hardwicke's judgment that the canons do not bind the laity *proprio vigore*; and we venture, under the shield of this authority, to assert that Convocation does not even represent the clergy. Just one half the Lower House, and by far the more important part, are the *ex officio* members. The proctors of the clergy are elected only by the beneficed clergy; and the amount of interest taken in the elections is small. It is true that the *ex officio* members are by far the most eminent. But this is precisely because they are least representative. A body which should merely reflect the opinions of the parochial clergy would be less than now able to look at national as opposed to class interests. The present Convocation has something of the discretion of a nominee council, but it lacks the energy which true representation gives. It does not represent the clergy; it in no sense represents the laity; and its relations to the lay bodies of the State, when it attempts to legislate, are simply insoluble.

These causes are sufficient to account for the impotence of Convocation. The individual members may be (and they are in many instances) very able and eminent men. But they are in the false position of being members of a representative body which represents nobody, a legislature to which legislation is impossible. The responsibility of legislation is exceedingly great, and its difficulties can only be overcome when the legislating body is armed with full authority, that is, in a free country, when it is in close sympathy with those for whom it legislates. Even the House of Commons varies greatly in its efficiency at different times according as it possesses more or less of this supreme qualification. After a general election in which the mind of the country has been fully declared, it advances boldly, its discipline is good, it discriminates clearly between important and fanciful proposals, and it is capable of doing its work admirably. But when it becomes doubtful of the real mind of the country, all this is reversed: unpractical suggestions gain an undue prominence; the House is broken into sections; time is lost, and the purpose and power of the assembly is dissipated. This, which is an exceptional state of the national, is the normal state of the clerical assembly, and makes it perfectly unfit to be the legislature of the whole Church.

Convocation as a clerical assembly has never shown an appreciation of any but clerical interests. In the discussions upon the Services which have taken place of late years, any one who has assisted at or attentively read any of its deliberations must have been struck by this. Each member (with but few exceptions) seems to be intent on establishing his own position as a theologian or ecclesiastic, and the question is always, How will this matter agree with the Councils, or with a theory of Episcopal government and divine right of the clergy? hardly ever, How will it affect the general convictions and needs of the country? The proposal to restore 'discipline' in the Church instead of altering the Burial Service was adopted in consonance with old tradition, not considering that it is an impossibility in the present day. The Athanasian Creed was retained, not because it is edifying, but because, from the clerical point of view, it would seem to be 'degrading' an ancient document to leave it out. Vestments and postures are judged not according to convenience or decency, or to the feeling of the country generally, but according to an almost feminine sentiment of what they are arbitrarily made to symbolise.

But when what is proposed is consonant to the general wish, the impossibility of carrying it into effect becomes most striking. Nothing can show this better than the history of the attempt to change the 29th canon, and to allow parents to be sponsors for their own children. The proposal to make this minute but salutary alteration was originally suggested in a report in 1854: it was brought forward as a substantial measure in 1860, and the proceedings relating to it occupy a considerable space in the reports on to the year 1872, when the following account of the result was given by the Prolocutor:—

'Our Convocation, acting under the Royal license, agreed to an alteration of the canon in 1861. The alteration consisted of the removal of the restriction with regard to parents, and the change of the word "particeps" into "capax" in the latter part of the canon, so as to make its general intention more clear. These changes were also approved by the Convocation of York. But the latter part of the proposed changes having been disapproved by the law officers of the Crown, this amended canon, although "enacted" by Convocation, was not published by "letters patent." Four years afterwards, that is in 1865, another effort was made to deal with this canon; and in that year we again enacted an amended canon, which only changed the old canon so far as to remove the restriction which prevented parents from being sponsors. This new proposal was, however, unacceptable to the Convocation of York; and upon this ground the "law officers" again declined to issue the "letters patent;" so that the canon has not re-

ceived hitherto that last act of authority which is supposed to be necessary to make it legally binding.'

This incompetence of Convocation is not a merely negative quality. It acts in several ways most perniciously for the interests of the Church. The debates, since it is known that they lead to no practical issue, become unreal, and they are a by-word for all that is unbusinesslike. They are reported, except in the barest outline, nowhere but in the clerical organs. Thus the more liberal and enlightened among the clergy come to be identified with proceedings which in no proper sense represent them. And the supposition that Convocation has some power hampers Parliament in the discharge of one of its proper functions, and prevents the Church and nation from pressing upon Parliament the measures which they need. And there are times at which it commits those whom it professes to represent to actions, like the synodical condemnation of books and men, in which the commonest rules of justice are not observed.

3. What has been said may well make us feel that no practical good is likely to flow from the Convocations. But it may still be thought that the Church requires some council of its own apart from that of the nation. We see no such necessity. We are aware that there are powerful minds who, acknowledging what was so frequently dwelt upon in the late Parliamentary debates, that 'the conflict of the spiritual and temporal' power was becoming the great and irrepressible question of the 'day,' think that the solution of this question is to be found in the separate organisation of these two powers. But it appears to us that this is merely to prepare for making the conflict more intense. The design of the national Church of England has been, in the view of the greatest men it has produced, to obviate the disruption of human life into separate spheres and to bind together the whole nation into one Christian commonwealth. It is true that the attempt has been imperfectly successful; but there is nothing which should induce us in this country to act on a counter-theory which arbitrarily divides the life of the community into distinct and hostile spheres. There have ever, indeed, been those who, like Warburton, have thought it more natural to speak of the relation of the Church and State of England as an alliance rather than a union, just as men like Rousseau in asserting individual independence spoke of society as formed by a Social Contract. But, while we admit the possibility of a disruption in the one case as in the other, we believe it to be in both cases unnatural. We are content to speak of an alliance or of a union provided

that it be admitted that national not sectarian interests are those with which the Church is concerned, and that the national organs are those through which its ends are to be wrought out.

The great argument of Hooker in the eighth book of the '*Ecclesiastical Polity*,' in defence of the English system, is directed against the dualistic theory of Church and State. He hardly takes any notice of the Convocations. We believe he only once names them, and then only as an adjunct to Parliament. His contention is that there can be only one law-making power, and his conclusion is as follows:—

'Wherefore to define and determine even of the Church's affairs by way of assent and approbation, as laws are defined of in that right of power which doth give them the force of laws; thus to define of our own Church's regiment the Parliament of England hath competent authority.'

Quite similar was the view of Burke as to what is called the union of Church and State.

'An alliance between Church and State,' he says, 'is in my opinion, an idle and a fanciful speculation. An alliance is between two things that are in their nature distinct and independent, such as between two sovereign states. But in a Christian commonwealth the Church and the State are one and the same thing, being different integral parts of the same whole. For the Church has been always divided into two parts, the clergy and the laity; of which the laity is as much an essential integral part and has as much its duties and privileges as the clerical member; and in the rule, order, and government of the Church has its share. Religion is so far, in my opinion, from being out of the province or duty of a Christian magistrate, that it is, and ought to be, not only his care, but the principal thing in his care.'

We might add the great name of Arnold, the greatest philosophical educator of our times, to those of the greatest constitutionalists in Church and State; and we believe, notwithstanding superficial appearances to the contrary, that their perception of the true principles on which the English polity is grounded will commend itself increasingly to the mind of their countrymen. It is not true that the conditions of the problem have so altered as to make their views inapplicable. That liberty of worship and equal rights should have been allowed to all only brings out more into relief the remarkable unity which in all essentials binds together nine-tenths of the English nation. Nor is it true that Parliament is ill-fitted for legislating upon religious questions. No one can have followed the debates in the House of Commons on the Public Worship Bill without acknowledging that the spirit shown in them was as earnest as that of any assembly of ecclesiastics, and far more calm and



truthful. Nor again is it true that the views we have alluded to are merely theoretical; they represent the fundamental hypothesis upon which the law of England has been framed.

'It must not be forgotten,' said Mr. Richard, the Nonconformist Member for Merthyr, in the late debate, 'that according to the law they were all members of the Church of England; for the Church was a national institution supported by national property, and administered by national authority. That authority was exercised in the names of Nonconformists as well as others; and therefore they could not set their faces too strongly against the theory sought to be set up with regard to established churches, that as regarded endowments and privileges they were national churches, but as regarded the authority and rights of the people they were independent sects.'

There is a theory of the Church which is alluded to in this speech, which we may call the theory, not of the High Church, but of the Petty or Mean Church. It has not the confidence, like the old High Churchmen, to ban all but the members of the Anglican Communion, nor, like them, does it approximate to Rome; but it dislikes Protestantism, and it limits its sympathies to those of its own body. It does not deny all rights to the laity; but by successive restrictions it would concentrate all real power in the Clergy. And it thinks it enough to justify such abridgment of liberty, that those who disapprove can resort to other communions. It would be well pleased to see the so-called Anglican Church, whether in name established or not, disassociated from the national interests—one only, though the largest, among the sects which are occupied in the work of religion in its narrower sense. We can well understand how the holders of such views should wish to erect the Convocations, whether reformed or unreformed, into the legislative bodies of their community.

But there are others who have larger sympathies, who yet wish to give power to a 'Church body' separate from the national government. These are the advocates of the reform of Convocation, and their views claim some consideration from us.\*

The reformers of Convocation denounce the existing Convocations, and desire to substitute for them one Convocation for the whole of England, which shall represent fully both the

---

\* A Society exists, with Lord Lyttelton as its President, for the Reform of Convocation in the sense above indicated. The views of the Society are clearly expressed in 'A Speech delivered in the Convocation of York,' by Archdeacon Prest, and published through the Secretary, the Rev. J. Bandinel, Elmley Rectory, Wakefield.

clergy and the laity of the Church. We sympathise with their motives, but not the less do we believe that their proposal is retrograde and futile.

We submit, first of all, that what is thus proposed is not a reform but an entirely new creation. The Convocations are the councils of the Archbishops, by which they obtain the advice of their clergy. What is now proposed is to have one national Convocation, and to have the laity as well as the clergy fully represented; in short, to create an Ecclesiastical Parliament for the whole realm.

There are two questions which should always be asked of the promoters of these views, and to which no answer has ever been given. 1st. What is to be your basis of representation? 2nd. What scope or functions do you mean to give to this new and vast creation?

(1.) If it be said that the electors are to be the communicants of the Church of England, or the present worshippers, or those who will sign a declaration of membership, this at once denationalizes the Church. It makes it an Episcopal Sect with a strong sacerdotal bias. The Church of England at present, for all purposes of legislation and general government, embraces all Christian people; and if it embraces a few others also—and they are very few indeed—this is by no means all loss: at all events in the present comprehension the loss is far more than counterbalanced by the gain. But by the proposed change something like one half of the Christian people of this country would be by a single little sentence disfranchised and cut off from all influence over the Church; and this would be a cutting off of almost the whole of the most vigorous Protestantism. If the Church of England ceases to be national all its worst features are bound upon it by the very terms of its exclusions. Those who are cut off are cut off in many cases simply because they have an abhorrence of such practices as the sale of livings, or because they object to the obligation to use a stated form of prayers on every occasion, or because of some other matter of controversy which might at least be left open as regards legal church-membership. And those who give in their unqualified adherence to the new body which is thus created, do so in many instances just because they like the distinctive things which have offended their brethren. Thus we close the door in the direction of all Protestant or liberal reform, and open it only in the direction of retrogression. It cannot be too clearly pointed out that this would also be the necessary meaning of the process called Disestablishment, and independent Liberals are beginning to perceive this.

But take the other alternative. You give the suffrage to the householders, and have the same constituency as Parliament; we then ask in what the new Assembly will differ from Parliament. Fancy schemes of representation or nomination may be framed, but they have no solid ground to stand on. We should have the same constituency; and the Convocation would be but a second Parliament, composed mainly of the same men.

(2.) But suppose this surmounted, and your Ecclesiastical Parliament established, what is it to do? We presume that it is to have real power. If not, it will share the futility of the present Convocations. But what power can be given it unless you make it supreme?

The claim of Convocation has always been that which it put forward in 1547, 'That all such statutes and ordinances as shall be made concerning all matters of religion and causes ecclesiastical may not pass without the sight and assent of the said clergy.' A similar demand has been put forward almost every year since the revival of Convocation. Let us take as an example a recent expression of this request for separate action on the part of Convocation. A gravamen was brought up by the Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury on Friday, May 1, 1874, and presented to the Archbishop as President, bearing the signatures of twenty-eight well-known members of the Lower House. It runs as follows:—'That in all cases where matters of religion, or matters affecting the consciences or the spiritual rights or interests of the clergy are to be made the subjects of legislative action in the Imperial Parliament, the said matters and the scope and details of the legislation intended in regard to them should first, and as of course, be submitted to the consideration of the two Convocations of the Clergy attendant upon Parliament, with whom, of constitutional and moral right, legislative action in regard to matters religious and spiritual ought regularly to begin, as money bills begin only in the House of Commons.'

On which the President observed that the scope of the proposed legislation was very wide indeed. Nothing, for instance, could affect the consciences of the clergy more than the Education Act. This, therefore, ought not to have been touched by Parliament without the previous consent of the Convocation. If, further, the scope of this legislation included all the interests of the clergy, this would certainly include their pecuniary interests, and therefore all the temporalities of the Church would be withdrawn from the control of Parliament.

As to spiritual and religious questions, if the word 'religious' were taken in the technical sense of monastic, it was intelligible; but if not, every matter of deep conviction affecting the interests of men must be religious: and therefore one by one all serious social questions must be absorbed by the Convocations. And if by spiritual rights were meant the discipline of the clergy, the best instance that could be taken was the Clergy Discipline Act. Would it be pretended that Parliament should not touch a subject like this until the Convocations had agreed upon what was to be passed?

We really can add nothing to these forcible expressions of one who in his exalted ecclesiastical position has always shown a statesmanlike appreciation of the national requirements, except the general remark that the attempt to separate human life and laws into two parts, religious and secular, spiritual and temporal, church and world, is impossible, and is most definitely antichristian. But if this be not what is meant, we are at a loss to know what is the scope of the legislative functions which it is intended to assign to the new Convocation.

We have heard it proposed, indeed, that the reformed Convocation, though not exercising legislative functions, should yet act as a committee of advice, the legislative power remaining with Parliament. But what would be the character of the advice to be tendered? Would Parliament be free to act against it? If so, the institution of a vast advising apparatus would be a mockery. But if Parliament is to be bound by the Convocation, the legislative power is taken out of its hands. If the assent of both is required, the legislative machine is more than ever clogged, and nothing can ever be done.

We are persuaded that the proposals for a reform of Convocation look in the wrong direction, and that in a national Convocation the evils of the present Convocations would not be removed but intensified, because all its discussions would proceed on a false basis. It may be necessary to relegate a number of questions to the region of local self-government, or to take other means to relieve the legislature of details which belong more properly to the sphere of administrative discretion than to that of legislation. But there can be but one central legislature. And the history of ecclesiastical measures during the last twenty years proves that Parliament is both capable and ready to legislate where sufficient cause is shown for its action.

4. Yet we are willing to admit that, if the Convocations had in practice shown a special share of wisdom, they might have commended themselves, against all our anticipations, as a

standing committee of advice, urging upon the Government the measures most important to the spiritual interests of the community. Neither in old times nor since its modern revival have they shown any such capacity.

There is a celebrated sermon of Latimer's, preached before the Convocation of 1536, in which he plainly tells them that all that they have done in a long series of meetings is to ex-hume the bones of a dead man and to try to kill a living one. Allowing for the hyperbole of an epigram, this saying might be applied to the Convocations in reference to their whole history. They have lived in the past rather than in the present and future (the proper sphere of the legislator), and the spiritual life of the country, if left to their sway, would have been paralysed. We may ask with confidence what good the Convocations have ever done to the Church and nation?

They have originated nothing. Of all the great changes in old times not one originated in Convocation. They assented at times to what was proposed by Royal Commissions and by a reformed bench of bishops, as when in 1547 they assented to the giving of the cup to the laity; but this has invariably been in cases in which it was clear that, if they refused, the thing would be done without them. The Articles of 1562 were in all essentials those which had been put forth ten years before. The canons of 1604, as we have already pointed out, were a mere record of the existing practice; we see in them nothing of the prescient wisdom of true legislation; the only thing original in them is the attempt to use the Royal Supremacy to stereotype the Anglican system, and to make the Crown represent not the whole but a part of the nation. The Convocations were the abettors of the fatal policy of 1640, and the organs of the reaction of 1662; they shipwrecked the scheme of comprehension in 1689, and became a scene of scandalous controversy by trying to become an Inquisition in the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Since the revival of the Convocations in 1853 their course has been similar in almost all respects. It is not, of course, to be denied that some good proposals have been made in the reports of the Committees of Convocation. The Convocations include many of the most eminent men among the clergy, such as the deans of our cathedrals, and when these men consent to serve upon committees it is always possible that good suggestions may be accepted in the report. But there, for the most part, they stop. The Houses proceed to go through the reports, and adopt or reject them as reports, not to take action upon them; each clause is discussed as in a debating club;

and since action is remote, if not impossible, the tendency is to emasculate whatever vigour there was in the reports; so that what is passed rarely contains anything that is valuable.

Yet we by no means deny that useful suggestions are at times accepted by Convocation, and we gladly touch upon one or two of these. The report on Intemperance, which was the work of the late Archdeacon Sandford, is laborious and exhaustive; and though from the nature of the case it could not lead to action in which Convocation as a body could bear a part, it has helped to stimulate the interest of churchmen in a cause of much importance. The reports also upon Patronage and Lay Co-operation have been of some value, though one of them at least is a subject of difference between the two Houses. But the reports and debates upon such matters as Church Discipline, Divorce, the Burials Bill, and upon Parliamentary matters, breathe quite the old spirit of exclusiveness, and show a dangerous tendency to interfere with the action of Parliament, and even with the settled law of the land. This statement may be verified by reference to a 'Code of Canons' agreed upon only last autumn by committees of the two Convocations, in which all who become Dissenters are proscribed, and men are solemnly warned not to do what the law expressly allows them to do; and it is declared that the Convocations have power to decree rites and ceremonies, and have authority in controversies of faith.

There are one or two matters of special importance in which the recent action of Convocation ought to be distinctly estimated by the country. Chief of these stands the Revision of the Authorised Version of the Scriptures, which is now in progress, and from which good results may be anticipated. The Convocation may fairly claim credit for having taken action in an enterprise which had been long contemplated and discussed without result; and we should be inclined to congratulate them entirely upon it but for two circumstances. The first of these is that it is probable that a very little pressure might have induced the Government to issue a Royal Commission for the purpose. The eager acceptance of the proposal by Convocation was thought by many to indicate a desire on their part, not so much that the revision should be made, as that the work should be done not through the national but through the ecclesiastical organs; and there would have been many advantages in the former course, particularly that some persons of eminence, whose absence on the Revision Companies has occasioned remark, might have been included under a Royal Commission. This however may well be let pass. But

what will always be remembered as a disgrace to Convocation is the bad faith in which an attempt was made to cast out one of the revisers who had been appointed in strict accordance with the original resolutions. The Committee of Convocation by which the revisers were to be named was appointed in May 1870, the resolutions of appointment authorising them to 'invite 'the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever 'race or religious body they may belong.' This form was adopted expressly in order that even Jews might be invited if needful; and in the Lower House a resolution was negatived after full debate which would have excluded 'such as deny the 'divinity of Christ.' It was soon known that a Unitarian minister had been invited to take part, and no objection was made to his appointment. Even when it was known that the revisers as a body had inaugurated their work by attending the Holy Communion together in Henry VII.'s Chapel, the gentleman in question being among them, though the attention of Convocation was called to this, only one member of either House took the opportunity to object to that gentleman's nomination. But in the beginning of the next year a discussion was raised in the Upper House, which was unfortunately persuaded to pass a resolution that no one who denied the Godhead of Christ should be a member of the company of revisers. Upon this the Bishop of St. David's refused to continue on the Committee of Revision, and it seemed likely that the whole scheme would be broken up. The Lower House fortunately were on this occasion better advised than the bishops, and after a debate, in which the Dean of Westminster was well supported by several of the more old-fashioned churchmen, a courteous request was sent to the Upper House to allow the question to be postponed till the Committee on Revision should have reported. This was explained to mean till the revision was completed; and a resolution for an earlier report of the Committee was refused; and further it was found that the Companies of Revisers had slipped out of the hands of Convocation, and had disposed prospectively of the copyright, which belonged not to the Convocation but to themselves. And thus while the Convocation is in the position of a mother who has been sorely tempted to devour her offspring, it will be saved in the future from the temptation to do so, at least until the child is full grown.

There are some persons who look with satisfaction and even a sense of triumph at the late instances in which the Convocations have assented to proposals which have been embodied in Acts of Parliament. There are however several things to

abate our satisfaction, so far as an estimate of the wisdom of Convocation goes. It is known that in 1865 the Convocation assented with something of eagerness to the new form of subscription which was embodied in the Act of that year. But what is not so well remembered, and indeed seemed opportunely to have slipped from the memory of the members themselves, is the preceding treatment of the subject in Convocation. In 1863, after a charge of the Bishop of London recommending an alteration of the subscriptions made by the clergy, a resolution was offered in the Lower House that it was inexpedient to make any alterations; and after examination of the subject by a committee, it was agreed that the only alteration needed was in one out of the seven or eight complicated forms by which the consciences of so many had been ensnared or alienated. This was in 1864, and we may therefore attribute the remarkable vote of the next year to the seasonable pressure of the Government, who were fully resolved to proceed with the measure whatever might be its treatment in Convocation. The new Table of Lessons proposed by the Ritual Commission was approved by Convocation; but a resolution which would have been fatal to it was only lost by the casting vote of the Prolocutor. And in the Act of 1872 for amending the Act of Uniformity, the Convocation, while it assented to the main provisions of the measure, was allowed to make considerable alterations for the worse. The Ritual Commission had recommended that upon week days, instead of the regular service, selections appointed by the ordinary might be used. This liberal proposal, which would leave the service to be adapted to varying needs, was reduced by Convocation to the prescription of a single uniform service. The Ritual Commission had proposed to acknowledge the rights of the laity; no alteration in the use of the Sunday services was to be made without due notice to the parishioners, and they were to have power to represent the matter to the ordinary, whose decision was to be given in writing; but this proposal was put aside by Convocation, who appeared to consider that a notice to the congregation that a change was about to be made was an ample recognition of their rights. The Government, in following Convocation instead of the Commission in all these points, justified the protest of Mr. Bouverie in Parliament against the recognition of Convocation in the Act—a recognition which had been wisely refused in the case of the Act for the Lessons in the previous year.

It is now proposed that Parliament should wait upon the Convocations for the reforms thought necessary in the use of



the Liturgy. We have the materials for estimating the wisdom of this proposal; for not only have many things been done in Convocation in reference to the Prayer-book, but letters of business were given to them in 1872 for the examination of the fourth report of the Ritual Commission; and an elaborate report upon the Rubrics was prepared by a committee, and adopted by the Lower House in July of last year. A pamphlet showing side by side the recommendations of the Commission and of Convocation was issued and printed with the 'Chronicle of Convocation' for 1873. It is not to be supposed that Convocation will in any material point recede from its deliberate and published opinions, though the Upper House, who have yet to go through the Rubrics, may possibly modify some of the conclusions of the Lower.

In the writings that precluded the revival of Convocation, nothing was more frequently insisted on than the importance of adapting the services of the Church to the growing wants of the population. Mr. Lathbury, in his 'History of Convocation,' published in 1842, dwells upon this as one main object of calling that body into activity. No one, he says, wishes to alter the prayers of the Liturgy, but the Rubrics want explanation and adaptation. Accordingly, one of the first things done by the Committees appointed at the revival was to make proposals upon this subject, among which we find most of the things which have now passed into law in the 'Act of Uniformity Amendment Act.' They also proposed special services, with some original prayers for various occasions, such as Harvest, or times of humiliation or of thanksgiving. But all these proposals split upon the rock of the impossibility of getting them enacted. Convocation wished not so much that the thing should be done as that itself should be the doer of it. Various devices were proposed, the passing of canons, the issue of royal proclamations—anything but the proper constitutional form through a Royal Commission and Act of Parliament. The secret of their want of success is to be found in a resolution of the Lower House, proposed by the late Chancellor Massingberd, that no alterations should be made in the Prayer-book without consulting Convocation, and without this being stated in the preamble of the Act—a sentiment which recurs again and again, and may be said to be the soul of Convocational action.

At length the Government determined to act, and in 1868 the Royal Commission on Ritual was appointed, which after sitting for three years published its fourth and final report. It cannot be said that the composition of the Commission was a

true reflection of the mind of the country. There was a great forgetfulness of the principle laid down by Convocation itself in its report on Ritualism, that 'great as is the value of the 'ancient ritual usages,' yet the genius of the English Church tends to simplicity of worship, and that 'the National Church 'of England has a holy work to perform towards the Nonconformists of this country.' The great section of the Church which would best insure the sympathies of the Nonconformists was all but unrepresented. And further, in the long-extended course of the Commission many of its best members fell out through sickness and other causes, so that the report is an inadequate expression of what the whole Commission would have recommended. Nevertheless, had their recommendations been embodied in an Act of Parliament, such an Act would have been a useful and healing measure. Whatever may be thought of the policy of submitting that report to the judgment of Convocation, there will be none, we expect, when that judgment is fully known, as to the impossibility of letting it govern the action of the Legislature. The report of Convocation was ably epitomised in a paper which appeared in the 'Times' about the end of last June, written evidently by one thoroughly conversant with the subject. We cannot put the matter more clearly than by giving the following extract:—

'It is not too much to say that in almost every instance of any importance the proposals for relaxation, whether emanating from the Commissioners or from others, were rejected, except so far as they favoured the strong ecclesiastical party dominant in Convocation; and that the few changes which Convocation itself proposed almost invariably leaned in the same direction. We will enumerate the several instances.

'The Royal Commissioners proposed that the daily service should not be considered compulsory. This proposal was rejected by Convocation. The Royal Commissioners proposed that the obsolete rule of public catechising should be relaxed. This was rejected. A proposal was made by some of the Commissioners that the sponsorial system, the cause of so much difficulty in so many parishes, should be relaxed. This was rejected. The Commissioners propose] that the Visitation Service need not be necessarily used by the clergyman in the pastoral ministrations to the sick. This was rejected. The endeavour to accommodate the Burial Service to the various needs of different classes in the parish by a variety of lessons and other such means, was rejected. The relaxation of the rubric which insists on the reading of the prayer for the Church Militant on all occasions, and the reading of the long exhortation before the Communion, was rejected. The proposal to render optional some parts of the Marriage Service was rejected. The permission to administer the Communion to more than one at a time, so urgently demanded by a large and respectable section

in the Church, and recommended by the Commissioners, was rejected. The permission to have the baptism of children other than in the public services was rejected. The rubric enforcing the use of the Communion Service was left unaltered.

'The relaxation of the enforced recitation of the Athanasian Creed, which was recommended by a majority of 19 of the Commissioners to 7, was in Convocation rejected by a majority of 54 to 12. On the other hand, among the few changes proposed by the Convocation, almost all turned on minute modes of exalting the outward sanctity of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, or some like fanciful points of ceremonial.

'These were the results of the elaborate revision of the rubrics, in itself reluctantly undertaken by Convocation, during the last year.'

The writer goes on to allude to the cases, which we have dwelt upon above, in which Convocation has acted effectively, always under the pressure of active measures being taken in Parliament; and urges that, unless such pressure be now applied, 'it is certain, from all its previous history, that Convocation will adhere to the principles to which it has hitherto pledged itself, and will admit of no other changes than those which further the interests of the party which now governs its majority.'

'On the possibility of the active intervention of Parliament,' the writer goes on to say, 'and on this alone, depends the question whether the Church is to be for the future delivered over, bound hand and foot, to the mercies of an assembly which, with very few exceptions, has proved itself as one-sided in its action as it has proved itself almost uniform in its inaction in anything which concerned the real wants of the nation. What it has done, we know; what it has refused to do, we know. If it is for the future to have the sole initiation in ecclesiastical matters, this is not an encouraging prospect for those who, while willing to give every element in the Church fair play, are not prepared to resign its whole conduct to that element which has hitherto shown the least forbearance and the least magnanimity.'

Since this statement appeared, the Upper House of Convocation have begun the consideration of the report of the Ritual Commission, and have, in the matter of daily prayers, desired the Lower House to appoint a committee to reconsider their report. But the discussions in the Upper House were chiefly on a proposal for a distinct dress in the administration of the Sacrament, which the majority appeared to view with favour; and in the Lower House the only things to which the committee were specially desired to attend were the dresses and postures of the clergy; a member who proposed that other and more important matters should be re-opened being conjured for the sake of peace to withdraw his proposal. The

process from which the Bishop of London appears to hope so much has begun under very poor auguries.

But while our expectation of any good from Convocation is feebler than ever, the possibility of Parliamentary action has become, through the spirit lately shown by the House of Commons, a strong probability. It is allowed to us to hope that the nation will once more assert itself as a Christian community, and adapt its public worship to its needs. While dealing justly with all parties, it will no longer think it necessary to reckon at every turn with the sacerdotal party as though its theories had any serious hold upon the national conscience. The two things which it has to do are, first, to make the law which governs these matters, whether rubric or canon, perfectly clear, adapting it in the process to the actual convictions and desires of a Protestant nation; and secondly, to fix upon some power which shall, within a given range, be at liberty to suit the services to local needs. It is not a rigid uniformity which law-abiding men require, but (with a uniformity in essentials) a clear definition of the local authority in whom the discretion rests in all non-essential matters. If this be once made plain, it will be possible to relax to some extent the uniformity, whenever it is felt to be oppressive; and, as by the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity power was given to the Queen to take order as to the 'Ornaments,' and to ordain further ceremonies and rites with the consent of her Commissioners or of the Metropolitan of the realm, it is possible that now also a discretion for allowing such relaxations as may from time to time be required may be vested in some body deriving its authority from Parliament and acting under its general control.

But whatever is done in the present matter, or in wider questions which may gradually open before us, the essential thing is that it should be done by Parliament itself, as alone capable of acting on behalf of the whole nation and in harmony with its desires. The statesman who shall bring this about, and enable the country, under the new conditions of this century, to exercise its proper control in ecclesiastical affairs, will deserve to rank with those who in the sixteenth century restored the ancient ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the crown of England.

**ART. VII.—*The Origin and History of the Grenadier Guards.***

By Lieutenant-General Sir F. W. HAMILTON, late Grenadier Guards. In Three Volumes 8vo. London: 1874.

**W**HEN General Trochu uttered those criticisms on the Third Napoleon's army which made his name a household word in France, and lifted him into chief power when she broke with the Empire, there was one that drew especial notice in this country. This was his absolute condemnation of élite corps as an integral part of any military force. What is gained in its perfection (so ran his general argument) is gained wholly at the expense of the bulk of the service. It is not possible to pick out of any army a specially good set of soldiers for such a corps, without giving it some material advantages. The temptations that these offer will not only drain from the ordinary regiments members that form their most vital element, but will tend to give the rest a sense of hopeless inferiority and neglect that must cause them insensibly to lose heart in their work. So far had this system of selection been carried in his own service for some seven years before he drew attention to it, that after taking privates away for the Guards, for the Zouave regiments, and finally for the flank companies of their own battalions, it had become a serious difficulty in the mass of the line battalions to find efficient noncommissioned officers; whilst to be among their rank and file was to wear a distinctive badge that a man was good for nothing else. But Guards, or Zouaves, or grenadiers, when under the enemy's fire, are just as likely to fall as other men. Their specially good services will not, therefore, even if they be fully admitted, avail to multiply their comparatively small number; and if to create them should inflict, as he contended, a serious injury on the whole of the army at large, the national account must on the whole be charged with a large loss under this system.

No one now doubts that Trochu was right in his strictures. However ill we may think of his own political or military conduct when the turn of events made him Governor of Paris and President of the Government of Defence, his work still remains unchallenged for its prophetic truth as to the results of the errors it exposed in the military organisation which Europe was wont to admire. Framed for show rather than use, and to give posts of honour and emolument to court favourites rather than to find leaders for the field, the military system of Napoleon III. proved itself under trial one of the most worthless institutions of his Empire, and its fall deservedly

brought with it his own amid the indignation of a great people who had trusted him with all their means in vain. The very apologies the ex-Emperor wrote in his banishment carry his condemnation with them; for throughout the pages of the *Wilhelmshöhe* and *Chiselhurst* pamphlets runs the admission that the writer knew and felt keenly the existence of defects which he yet was powerless to correct under the political system that owed its entire framework to himself.

It is false logic, however, that argues from the French example in this matter that an army must of necessity suffer deterioration by the maintenance of select regiments. To take the most patent example of military excellence; we see that the Prussians have deliberately adopted a large Guard Corps as a cherished military institution. The Austrians, on the other hand, for political reasons which only those can appreciate that know the suspicious nature of the reigning family, have always dispensed with any Guard Corps in their large army; yet this has never commended itself as a model for the imitation of other nations. What Trochu denounced was in fact not the creation of an Imperial Guard, or of special regiments of light infantry, but the creation of these at the expense of others. When once the practice is introduced of transferring good soldiers as a reward from their own battalions to élite corps, or from the mass of the regiment to its own flank companies (the latter an old practice in our own service most properly abolished) then indeed the bad effect on those left behind is certain to make itself felt. We have had a truly national warning of the evils of such a system as applied to the officer class in the old Company's Indian army, where the regimental cadres were mercilessly robbed of every man of energy and ability to feed the civil departments or to command irregulars. As a direct consequence those left to do duty with the regular Sepoy regiments were, as a rule, the dross of a large body. Weak often in numbers, these remnants of the cadres were weaker still in military qualities; and the fearful mutiny that almost swept our rule out of the land was the just Nemesis of a system that took away the natural security of a government dependent on a vast force of armed natives, by depriving the body that officered that force of all its best elements. There is no need to criticise this system now. It has condemned itself sufficiently by its results; as did that of which Trochu wrote with such bitter truth in 1867. But the Prussian Guard Corps is founded on a different basis altogether, being recruited direct from civil life all over the kingdom. A higher standard, no doubt, is expected from the men that enter it than from the

ordinary recruit of the line; and thus it is in truth an élite body, though not made so by the mistaken process of robbing the ranks of less favoured regiments than its own of their best soldiers.

Thus it is too with our own noble regiments of Foot Guards. Enlistment in the battalions is free, far freer indeed than it could be under any modification of the Prussian system, under which the peasant taken for the Guard Corps in Westphalia or Posen has usually little choice in the matter, and is only interested so far that his new lot changes the site fixed for his involuntary service with the colours. In both services, however, the broad rule is the same; selection out of the great mass of the population of men not already enrolled for duty. And in both the mainspring relied on for excellence is not the test of military training already passed through, but the glorious traditions and hereditary discipline of the body among which the recruit's lot is to be cast. Of each of the services we are for the moment comparing it may be said that its battalions are not creations apart from the army, much less made at its expense, but rather standing models of excellence to other regiments; more identified than these with the history of the land, and more honoured, because they have in their long past done more for its honour than their comrades.

Such is, above all, the case with our own First or Grenadier Regiment of Foot Guards, whose story General Hamilton has undertaken to tell. Objections may be raised to the method of his work as too laborious for such a limited subject as the history of a single corps. It may be said that he has weakened in some degree the interest of his tale by the very labour of love which he has spent upon its details; by the industry which has led him to ransack records new and old, British and foreign, for every particular that could throw light on his subject. The cumbrous illustrations will seem to some overdone. Others may object to the over-carefulness with which he has inserted trifling regimental changes amidst the recital of stirring national events. But the fact is that the *History of the Grenadier Guards* is a microcosm of that of the whole British army. At once its oldest and most distinguished regiment, it has shared not only its world-wide honour and successes, but those reverses and trials with which the varied history of the standards that have crossed the whole globe is chequered. It witnessed Fontenoy as well as Blenheim; it bore part in the surrender of Yorktown as in Cornwallis's fleeting triumph in Carolina; it retreated before the French through Flanders under York, as it pursued the French through Flanders under

Wellington. And ever in the darker as in the brighter pages of its story, it has maintained the same character for enduring steadfast courage and unshaken discipline, coupled with warm feeling between men and officers; high qualities which, we are proud to believe, are characteristic of the whole British infantry, of which this corps is but the brightest example. For these are the virtues which have drawn praise alike from ally and from foe; which the cold pen of the great Prussian critic who watched them through Waterloo, and the pithy comment of the rough conqueror of Algiers who retreated before them in the Peninsula, have done such full justice to, as patriotic admiration of our brave soldiers may gratefully accept as testimony that none can dispute.

But there is more than this lesson in the work that comes under our notice. For in its chapters may be traced the whole development of the adventurous and active side of our modern polity, which in days of increasing commerce and growing wealth, protected by imperial strength, we are too ready to ignore. We rest on our conquests now. There are some of us, indeed, so blind to history's teachings that they would call our colonies an encumbrance, the policy that reared them a dream, our fierce protests against would-be enslavers of Europe expensive and useless errors. For these men it would be the same had England never reached her armed hand to east or west to protect the adventurous pioneers that went forth to found new Englands where the sun rises and where it sets. The merchant and the manufacturer, they say, would be doing the same work now had we never sent sailor or soldier from our shores. They have forgotten how different the face of this world would have been had Englishmen never lifted arms out of England. Had such counsellors been in power when Chatham lived, Montcalm might have accomplished his dream of the universal domination of France in America, and the Latin race excluded the English from it for generations. Had they ruled later instead of Chatham's great son, half Europe might have still been governed by French prefects, and Ireland have been a hostile republic, threatening us in our vitals at every change of the political horizon. Had they controlled Clive and Clive's successors, India might have been a French dependency, or a mass of semi-barbarous states still, such as it was when we won the foothold, which when once won has grown steadily into an empire by a law we could not control. But their teaching has had little power over the national life, and their doctrines have passed into disrepute. There is little fear now-a-days that Englishmen will yield to foreign rivals what their



forefathers' blood and treasure have won; the blood and treasure which have guarded what English spirit and enterprise first gave the nation, whose offshoots to-day, notwithstanding the blunders in policy and reverses in war that have caused the mightiest of them to separate from its parent stem, make the race of our little island the foremost among peoples, and its language the most widespread of tongues. Those who would see how this came about, how the national spirit has created the national greatness, may find the story in epitome among the pages that are before us for review. •

When, more than two hundred years since, this now loyal land of ours was governed by the great Protector; when forced by the Nemesis of revolution, Cromwell had given up all pretence of constitutional rule; when power was centred in one man as never before had been in England's chequered history; it was natural that her ruler should seek that popularity by a daring attitude abroad which the iron pressure of circumstances denied to his domestic measures. Reviving the audacious policy that carried Drake and Raleigh long before to America to check the growing power of the Spaniard in the New World, and fortifying himself for his undertaking by treaties with Holland, Portugal, and Sweden, he sent a well-equipped fleet to attack, without previous warning, the Spanish West Indies, and took possession of Jamaica, long afterwards one of our richest colonies. War followed as a matter of course, and the Protector, resolved to carry it home against the old enemy of the Protestant cause, whose predominance in Europe had decayed as her power rose in the New World, sought for his end to form an alliance with France against Spain. To do this would, of course, be to put an end to the lukewarm protection that King Louis had hitherto extended to Charles II. since his father's death on the scaffold, and, on the other hand, it would throw the weight of Spain into the cause of English royalty. But this new risk was worth running if the proposed treaty with France should give the Protector such a foothold in the Low Countries as would avail to check any attempt to be made thence at the dreaded invasion in favour of the exiled monarch. Moreover, Spain was in those days traditionally hated and feared far more than France had ever been by the Protestant body of the English and Scotch; and a king claiming to be such by virtue of help from the most Catholic of sovereigns would rouse afresh the fanaticism now dying in the reaction that had succeeded the strain of revolution. Cromwell's plans were indeed as far-reaching as though he

hoped to found a dynasty that should thrive on their results, and executed with a vigour equal to the sagacity of their conception. On September 2, 1655, the treaty with France was signed in London, which put English ships and soldiers at the service of the French king, who was preparing to attack the Spanish Netherlands. The natural answer to this was a counter-treaty entered into between the King of Spain and Charles II., formally engaging Spanish aid to assist the latter in the recovery of his throne. One strong inducement to this step on the side of the court of Madrid was the hope that Charles's name might be of service to draw from France the Irish regiments then serving under France; and the banished king, now changing his place of abode from Cologne to the Netherlands, to be nearer Don John of Austria, the governor of the country, entered into negotiations with him as to raising an English contingent out of his loyal adherents. Strange to say, the liberal estimate of 10,000 horse and foot put forward on Charles's side, instead of being treated for what it was, the sanguine vision of a refugee, seems not only to have been believed in by the Spanish ministry, but actually to have filled them with alarm, lest their new ally should prove too formidable even in his exile. Personal motives of the meanest kind had certainly at least as much weight in those days as now; for we hear of Condé, who had recently accepted a Spanish command, secretly opposing the acceptance of Charles's proposal, out of fear that he might be superseded by the chief of this new contingent, who, it was well understood, would certainly be the king's brother, James, Duke of York. And, far more strange than this, the curious intrigues characteristic of that age of petty statecraft appear to have brought the Duke of York soon afterwards into indirect correspondence with Cromwell himself. The good understanding that arose between these two utterly opposed natures actually caused the Protector to assent to the duke's remaining with the new ally of England; whilst Cardinal Mazarin increased his pension from the French Court with the same object of keeping him from joining Charles, and so of retaining the Irish regiments enlisted under the fleur-de-lys from loyalty to the exiled king: so valuable was good fighting material counted on the Continent in those days of sparse population and voluntary enlistment.

At this time Charles's treaty with Don John had not been ratified finally by the Spanish Crown. When this ceremony was performed, the king again urged his brother to join him, as he had done when the alliance was first broached; but he was still put off with excuses, until the Irish regiments them-

selves claimed their discharge from Mazarin under the terms of their enlistment, which reserved to them the right of joining their lawful sovereign. Notwithstanding official refusals, they gradually left the French lines without opposition to follow their officers into the Netherlands. Then at last the Duke of York (on whom a much higher value seems to have been set at this time than during any other part of his chequered career) took his leave of the French Court, and of the pension he had clung to, and joined his brother at Bruges, apparently with an ill grace enough. Thenceforward the embodiment of such regiments as Spain could find supplies for when raised, was duly proceeded with. Ormond, formerly Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, formed one of his own countrymen as an addition to those loyal battalions which had left better quarters behind them in France. Scots came from Germany, and even from distant Sweden, in those days accounted the most warlike State of Europe, and found their services accepted in a regiment raised under Lord Middleton; the lieutenant-colonelcy of which (we are told by Sir F. Hamilton) was 'procured by Sir 'James Levingston for a sum of money:' so thoroughly had the system of purchase been recognised even before the present standing army came into existence, as it was now about to do in its first regiment. Whilst Irish and Scotch were being enrolled according to their nationalities, their comrades in loyalty from England were not behindhand. About four hundred of these, 'all staunch royalists, who had commenced flocking 'to Charles's standard as soon as he raised it on his arrival in 'Flanders in the spring,' were formed into a separate corps to be known as His Majesty's Royal Regiment of Guards, which still lives in the First Regiment of Foot Guards, the subject of General Hamilton's work.

In creating such a regiment under the express condition that it was 'to do duty in the army like his other troops, until the 'King should be in a position to bring it about his person,' words which might stand for a motto to its whole history, Charles was but imitating his father's example. Indeed certain antiquarian guardsmen have been wont to trace the descent of their corps from that body of King's Guards which Charles I. raised at Oxford during his memorable sojourn there during the winter of 1642-43, when the general of his artillery was ordered to furnish it with arms before his other troops, 'they being in number 512 men, whereof there are 322 unarmed.' But though many of the individuals, that served in this regiment up to its disappearance at the fall of the royal cause four years later, served also, as our author has proved, in the King's Guards of

Charles II., created ten years later than that fall in the Netherlands, the connexion is but personal and accidental. The real origin of the regiment is to be found amongst the contingents subsidised by Spain, from which its existence may be traced unbroken down to the present day. Yet it has always been doubtful, and the care with which General Hamilton tells this part of the story only brings this doubt more forward, whether Lord Wentworth's regiment of loyalists would have continued to exist under the restored monarchy, but for its happy amalgamation with another body which had almost equal claims on the royal gratitude, and more potent friends about his person than the faithful companions of his exile who received their commission at Bruges in 1656.

But we are anticipating matters. The King's Guards had not been two years formed when they had as fine an opportunity of displaying the undaunted valour that has long been admitted all over the world, as ever fell to the lot of the corps during its varied service in the two following centuries. The war so long talked of seriously began in 1657, though in the curiously methodical way that renders it difficult to regard the campaigns of that age with any serious interest or hope of profitable lesson. Turenne gained some advantages that year over the Spanish commander, Caracena, who faced him on the existing frontier of the monarchies between Calais and Dunkirk; and in 1658 the French general proceeded to invest the latter fortress, the approaches to which had been left by his adversary unguarded. Caracena, resolving to relieve the place, got within a few miles of it, and then took up a defensive position to wait for his artillery, which had been left behind on his march according to the fashion of the time. It was whilst waiting for it that he was attacked by Turenne, who thus brought on the famous battle of the Downs, the only one in England's long roll in which her sons have been opposed face to face under foreign banners. Generals Morgau and Lockhart, whom Cromwell had sent over to aid the French, commanded formidable contingents in Turenne's small army of 15,000 soldiers; whilst on the other side, in the Duke of York's mixed corps from the three parts of Great Britain and Ireland, which had never, it seems, numbered over 2,000 men all told, except on paper, were some companies of the Royal Guards, who were already thus beginning their duty fighting for the king who had raised them 'like his other troops.'

The course of the battle was of the simplest, and is naturally and clearly told in General Hamilton's pages. Caracena's line, following it from the right which rested on the sea, was com-

posed successively of Spaniards, English, Irish, Walloons, Germans, and a French corps under Condé; so many countries had to be searched for soldiers in those days in order to put 14,000 effectives on the battlefield. Turenne advanced to the attack, supported by a powerful artillery which told greatly in his favour, as did still more the effective action of his left wing, where the brigades of English, inured to victory in days of civil war now gone by, came on in the perfect order they had learnt under Cromwell. The Spanish gave way before them precipitately. Condé's troops on Caracena's left were as unfortunate against their own countrymen, and presently retreating, carried with them the Germans and Walloons. The Irish, seeing themselves thus abandoned, followed their allies to the rear; but the Duke of York had been ordered by his commander-in-chief to hold a certain commanding sand-hill with the pick of his troops, and had placed the Royal Guards there. What follows may well be told in General Hamilton's own words, which are the more impressive in their natural tone and disregard of pictorial effect:—

‘The account of their conduct given by the Duke of York, who was an eye-witness to their gallantry, will speak for itself. He relates that this regiment of Guards had been posted together with Lord Bristol's regiment on the left of the Spaniards near the elevated sand-hill, and stood firm notwithstanding that they saw all the regiments to their right and left routed and quitting the field, including Lord Bristol's Irish regiment. The officers of this latter corps had made strenuous efforts to rally their men, but seeing they were ineffectual, they retreated also, with the exception of Captain Strode, an English gentleman, who observing his own regiment retiring, came and joined the king's regiment of Guards, some of whose officers had gone for orders. None of these circumstances, however, in any way daunted the courage of the king's regiment of Guards, both officers and men continued firm and maintained their ground, while the first line of the French infantry passed them on their left-hand, and some of Cromwell's regiments on their right. The second line of the French then came upon them, commanded by the Marquis de Rambures, who having much esteem for Charles II., and observing this small body of men in the service of their sovereign, deserted by their allies, and standing alone in the field against the now victorious French army, went up to them himself, before his own men, to offer them quarter. They replied that they had been posted there by the Duke, and were therefore resolved to maintain that ground as long as they were able. Rambures remarked that it would be to no purpose for them to hold out as their whole army was routed and had left the field. They answered again, “that it was not their custom to believe an enemy;” upon which he proposed, that if they would send out one or two officers, he would himself accompany them to a sand-hill in their rear, from whence they

would perceive that what he affirmed was true. Two officers accordingly were sent out, and conducted by Rambures to the hill, whence they perceived that they alone of the whole Spanish army were left on the field. On their return to the regiment they reported what they had seen, when the officers, still determined, even in this their last extremity, not to yield except upon terms dictated by themselves, told him that in case he would promise that they should not be delivered up to the English, nor be stripped, nor have their pockets searched, they would lay down their arms and yield themselves prisoners of war. He agreed to this, giving his word for its due performance.\*

Had this passage in the history of a regiment told its only good achievement, it would have been worth preserving; but what the newly-raised Guards were when abandoned on the downs of Dunkirk, that they have proved themselves wherever the banner of England has led them. It was the same unyielding spirit that nerved them more than a hundred years later, when outflanked by superior numbers, and abandoned by the local volunteer levies in the swamps of Carolina, they wrested victory for Cornwallis from what seemed desperate odds. But not even when thus successful against hope, still less when sharing the glory of the memorable advance that shattered Tallard's army into ruin at Blenheim, or that yet more famous charge that broke Napoleon's last reserve at Waterloo, is the character of this noble regiment seen at its brightest. For it is in a desperate hour of the warrior, when all hope of victory is gone, and there remains nothing left but to lose all save honour, that the highest part of courage is displayed, the cool fortitude that can bear as well as do, retreat undismayed as well as undauntedly advance. We shall illustrate this quality by later instances. For the present we return to the task of tracing from the materials carefully gathered for us the exact history of the formation of the regiment as it now appears in our Army List.

Though the officers of the Guard captured before Dunkirk were soon exchanged, the regiment itself had been almost annihilated. Nor was the Spanish commander in a position to keep the field after his decisive defeat. Dunkirk fell into the hands of the strange allies, and under the terms stipulated by Cromwell was made over to Lockhart, his representative, by the generalissimo of Louis XIV. Turenne's forces continued to advance into the heart of Flanders, and it seemed as though

---

\* Captain Strode (General Hamilton adds) received the reward of his conduct by being appointed Captain of a company in the Royal Guards, and, twenty-eight years later, died in command of the regiment that he had voluntarily joined in the hour of danger.

Cromwell's designs were to be realised, and the Spaniard dislodged for ever from his threatening watch in the Channel, when an event occurred which changed the whole political state of Europe, with that of the British Isles which were most directly concerned. Two months after Dunkirk had passed into Cromwell's power, that power came to an abrupt end by the death of the great Protector, who had looked forward to this hold on the shore of the Continent as the surest means of keeping watch over the invasion he never ceased to dread. With his death the finer threads of his policy slackening, fell instantly into confusion abroad and at home. The attempt made to continue the succession in his family met no favour. Indeed it had such an air of unreality about it that the new Protector, by his own act, brought his power speedily to an end, and disappeared with little ceremony from the post he had unwillingly filled, history hardly deigning to record his rule. England then fell into political chaos; of no great violence happily, for party passion had burnt itself out in the long years of revolutionary struggle. Monk resolved to bring this confused state of things to a close by the restoration of King Charles. The very ease with which his design was carried out shows that it was the only possible solution of the national difficulty. The force with which he marched from Scotland had in it, until he distributed fresh commissions, but few officers that could be reckoned on for their general's views. There were still fewer inclined to favour royalty in the garrison left since Cromwell's death in London. Yet Monk had no difficulty, assisted by the Parliament he restored, in mixing loyal volunteers with the old regulars, removing from the metropolis regiments likely to be troublesome, and carrying out all other measures necessary for the peaceable and bloodless return of the King which followed four months later.

The remains of the Royal Guard did not accompany their monarch across the Channel. Of the reasons for their being left in Flanders General Hamilton tells us nothing; but the chief one was no doubt a politic as well as a courageous wish on Charles's part, to trust for his reception entirely to the goodwill that brought him home. From Namur, its last quarters under the Spanish treaty, the regiment was now moved to Dunkirk, and formed part of the same garrison as the late victors in the battle of the Downs. Yet so good was the discipline of the latter, or so weak their attachment to the Republic whose standards they had followed, that this sudden admixture of friend and foe seems to have given no one any trouble; and the whole of the garrison remained exempted from the disband-

ment of the large standing army maintained by Cromwell, which was one of the first acts of the new government, approving itself equally to Parliament and King. Our author repeats the praises prudently and justly bestowed by Charles on this occasion, on the order, discipline, and sobriety, as well as the 'manners, courage, and successes, which had made this army to be 'feared throughout Europe;' but only to express, in one of the weaker passages of a generally sensible work, his own dissent; thus proving unconsciously that a Guardsman of Queen Victoria's days may be more extreme in loyalist sentiment than one of the Stuarts themselves.

Seven months after the King had landed, the last of the old army that held England in awe during the Protectorate had been peacefully got rid of, with the exception of a small force devoted personally to Monk. Looking back upon the circumstances of the time, it seems wonderful that Charles put off from month to month, as it seems certain that he did, his design of raising any troops of his own to secure his authority. But the leading men of the Restoration party had a natural horror of that military government which the nation had just escaped from, a sentiment which, as Macaulay showed, they bequeathed for generations to the Tory gentry who succeeded them. The project was therefore mooted from time to time only to be combated by objections from the King's advisers. Drafts of intended establishments were prepared, to be laid aside. It was not until the end of November, when the last of the Republican regiments, except Monk's, had been got rid of, that Colonel Russell, a loyalist of tried fidelity, received a commission to raise a regiment of Foot Guards, twelve hundred strong, which became the second element, as will presently appear, in the formation of the modern Grenadiers, and which, by an order still extant in the State Paper Office, was 'to be 'held and esteemed the oldest regiment' of the royal army to be founded on it.

No reference was made on this occasion to the existence of the older regiment of Royal Guards left in garrison at Dunkirk, to whose story we must return. A petition to the King, prepared at Namur and signed by twenty-one of the officers, seems to show that they had feared their being left in Flanders would lead to their being altogether forgotten. If so, they did Charles injustice, for one of his first acts, after he was peacefully seated on his recovered throne, was to issue a new commission to Lord Wentworth as colonel, of a more valid and legal sort than that under which he had hitherto commanded them. By the time this was made out the regiment had been moved



to Dunkirk, and Wentworth, who had accompanied his sovereign to London, went over for a time to the fortress to reorganise his corps. At this time Dunkirk was held by a British garrison of over 4,000 men, of whom about a hundred only were professed loyalists, the 'skeleton companies' of Lord Wentworth's regiment; so that it is not surprising that in the early part of March 1661, the King's attention having been called to the risk to which the place was exposed should the old Cromwellian troops there show disaffection, it was resolved to take the precaution of raising the Guard to its proper strength of twelve hundred; and Lord Wentworth was authorised to enlist the necessary recruits, the order being carried out with so little difficulty as to show that either the pay given was deemed a liberal wage or that employment was very scarce.

Lord Rutherford, the new loyalist governor of Dunkirk (who fell afterwards in a sally against the Moors when holding the same post at Tangiers), was still uneasy at his responsibilities, and wrote of the republican spirit prevailing amongst the other regiments of his command, and of the probable necessity of removing many officers. But it would seem that the spirit of disaffection to the Crown, if really as widespread as he feared, was not very serious. The King's Guards fraternised honourably and easily with the rest of the garrison, 'their example tending,' according to General Hamilton, 'to spread the feeling of loyalty amongst the old 'Republicans.' This assertion may, of course, be taken as merely the panegyric of their historian; but it receives confirmation from the fact that, when in 1662, the officers of the Guards offered the Governor, with the consent of their men, to assist without extra pay in the large works undertaken for the improvement of the harbour and defences, the example of loyalty and good feeling proved contagious. The other regiments soon followed it by volunteering in succession, and 'whole 'companies were to be seen with shovels on their shoulders and 'drums beating, marching under competent officers to their 'daily labours.' 'The King,' it is added, 'was much gratified 'when he heard of these proceedings;' a natural feeling in the sovereign who had taken so personal a share in the formation of the regiment that led the way in this spontaneous proof of sound sentiments. Charles was thinking chiefly of the past, no doubt, and cared little for the inheritance of good traditions which such conduct in a regiment bequeaths; but those who know how gratefully our engineers before Sebastopol acknowledged the thoroughness with which the Guards Division gave itself during the weary siege to the labours of the trenches,

and what an admirable example its men set of the readiness good soldiers should have to do their full share of spade-work as well as of fighting at need, should not be unmindful of those early labours at Dunkirk which followed so soon on the regiment's first action near that place.

The fortress hard won by Cromwell's gallant troops in that battle, and strengthened by the volunteer labours of victors and vanquished; the place of arms which he had destined for England's watchtower on the opposite side of the Channel; was not to stay long in the hands of the nation to which he had bequeathed it. Charles had already met some of those pecuniary necessities to which his policy during the latter part of his long reign became enslaved. The expenses of garrisoning the singular dower of Tangiers brought him by Catherine of Braganza, were hardly less than those of holding Dunkirk. His sister, about to be married to the Duke of Orleans, had to be handsomely portioned. Fleets were at once more difficult to get rid of and far more popular with Englishmen of that age than battalions; and a large navy was therefore to be maintained even when a standing army ceased to exist. Arbitrary taxation had been rendered impossible to an English king since Charles's father had sacrificed his crown in attempting to enforce it; and it was accordingly necessary to economise. The possession of Dunkirk was the sacrifice selected for the immediate exigency, and after many doubts and delays a commission was signed on September 1, 1662, by Charles the King, under which it was to be ceded for a large sum to Cromwell's late ally, the monarch who, five years before, had openly betrayed the cause of Charles the exile and leagued himself with the usurper of the Stuarts' throne. Louis was only too anxious to possess himself of a fortress which, whether in Spanish or English hands, was a standing menace to the northern frontiers of his kingdom; and the bargain was pressed on with all possible speed on his side, the inhabitants themselves being called on for loans wherewith to supply all the needs of the garrison and hurry it away. Englishmen may be glad, in the light of modern policy, that their fathers so soon got rid of the dangerous possession added to the country by Cromwell's policy; but the manner in which it passed from her hands may well raise a blush in those who are jealous over her honour in past days. The contract was duly carried out by Charles's commissioners, and in November 1662 the Royal Guard was on its way back to that England which it had not yet seen, though it had carried her King's colours for six years with unblemished honour. As the French account of Louis's agents, in Général

Hamilton's rendering, proceeds to say, 'they knew not without 'this successful negotiation [with the town authorities who 'made the advances] what might have been the result, as on 'the passage of the troops to England, they met the messenger 'carrying the order of the English Parliament to the governor 'not to deliver over Dunkirk into the hands of the French;' for Charles's Parliament was by no means submissive to his will in the matter of the bargain. Lord Rutherford, however, had executed his orders so promptly on receiving the necessary arrears due to his troops, that the time for this supposed intervention had gone by. Nor did he meet with the least opposition from the Cromwellian regiments about to be disbanded, of whom he reported, thus contradicting his own former fears, 'the most civil, obliging, and unparalleled carriage in laying 'down their arms, to the glory of the English soldiers, and 'thus giving the lie to those who would accuse them of mutiny.'

From this time until the death of Lord Wentworth in 1665, there were two distinct regiments of Royal Guards quartered in England; each admitted to have precedence over all other troops, and each claiming it over the other; 'Lord Wentworth's, as the oldest regiment in the service of the sovereign, raised in 1656, in Flanders; Colonel Russell's, as his 'was the oldest on the English establishment, having been 'the first raised in England after the Restoration.' Charles seems never to have had the courage to decide this difficult question; but he took the opportunity of Lord Wentworth's death to put an end to the controversy by amalgamating the two into one. Apparently the decease of the loyal nobleman was unexpected, for on the very day it occurred a warrant had been issued to augment the Russell regiment. This was never acted on; and shortly after the incorporation of the two corps was completed. So far as it was absolutely necessary, the original question of official precedence was now decided in favour of Colonel Russell's original command, since the companies in it were placed on the list before the others, and the lieutenant-colonel and major of the combined regiment were taken from his. As to Colonel Russell's own nomination to his new command, it was deemed a matter of such importance in the court circle of the day, that it seems to have led to a duel between that officer and another aspirant to the honour, the Duke of Richmond and Lennox, the last of the title who descended from the royal family of Scotland. Combatants and seconds were on this occasion treated with sharp displeasure, and committed for a time under royal warrant to the Tower; but Colonel Russell's detention did not operate against his just claim, although

it was made longer than the Duke's, as a sort of compliment to the latter's Stuart lineage: and his commission seems to have been actually made out whilst he was still in prison petitioning earnestly for the King's forgiveness.

It should be mentioned that if the date of this commission, which was also that of the appointment of the other field officers of the new regiment, were to be held as that of its proper formation, it would have to yield in point of antiquity to the only less famous Coldstreamers, originally Monk's own Guards, who were formally disbanded, and then re-enlisted in a body as a new regiment in the king's service, on February 14, 1661, having been the last of the old parliamentarian army called on to lay down their arms after the Restoration. As this regiment had existed many years before, and as a document in the State Paper Office shows that in the previous January it had 'been determined to continue it,' it is not surprising that its claims to superior antiquity should have been put forward both on this historic ground, and also on that of the renewal of Colonel Russell's commission four years after the date above mentioned, when the two regiments of Royal Guards were made one under him. General Hamilton, speaking on behalf of his corps, bases its right to seniority distinctly on the technical ground that Colonel Russell's first commission as Colonel of Guards bears date some months before the disbandment and new formation of the Coldstream Guards. To us it seems that he unnecessarily weakens what should be an unsailable case by this too legal view. The historic facts are, that Charles was restored without opposition after Cromwell's death as the lawful sovereign of the country. Lord Wentworth's regiment had then been for years his first regiment and Royal Guard. It continued to be so after he was installed on his throne, and remained unchanged in form or substance: though, to avoid any legal doubts as to its payment from English sources when his Spanish subsidies were withdrawn, he very prudently re-commissioned its colonel. It was not, however, ever disbanded, or its continuity of existence suspended for an hour; and although joined to Colonel Russell's regiment some years later, when it lost its first chief, it was still the identical Guard whose members had cast their fortunes boldly in with those of their banished king, that fought in his cause against their republican countrymen before Dunkirk, and that shared in the prosperity of his return. History cannot parallel this instance of loyalty in a corps thus rewarded. No army list can pretend to produce its rival; and it is a mistake in sentiment as well as logic

to put the pretensions of the Grenadier Guards to be the first regiment of England on any lower ground.

Holding it to be no less than this, it would be well, before we dismiss the subject, to say a few words on the general question of precedence as concerns the various arms. The present conventional arrangement is a wholly erroneous one, being founded on no proper rule or historic precedent. If the mere antiquity of each service were to be the rule, there would be a fair excuse for putting cavalry at the beginning of the Army List; but then the artillery and engineers should obviously follow the infantry. But if the actual importance of the branch of the service governed their order, then beyond question that should stand first to which the others have been, and will be, ever more or less appendages. That victory must in the main depend on the infantry is a truth which successive wars only bring more and more into prominent light; and this fact, which all soldiers instinctively recognise, should be recognised officially whenever proper opportunity occurs. We have had more indefensible mistakes recorded in our Army List than that we are now concerned with, which the enlightened spirit that now presides over war administration has done away with; such as that which formerly gave the two scientific corps a distinct commander-in-chief in the Master-General of the Ordnance. The present arrangement of precedence is very much as though soldiers were valued in proportion to the quantity of ornament they carry on their persons. The contrary should rather be the rule; and if their importance to the sovereign and the nation were regarded as the special qualities which make them valuable, the British infantry, which even foreign critics have allowed to be unequalled, should stand at the head; and first of all the infantry would come, as now, the Royal Regiment of Grenadier Guards.

It is not our purpose to follow with General Hamilton the varied feats of arms this corps has performed from the days of the battle of Dunkirk to those of Sebastopol. But as before pointed out, it is in the time of defeat that the highest qualities of the soldier appear; and those who search the records of such important battles as Neerwinden (1693), Almanza (1707, the most terrible disaster a British general ever suffered in a European field), and Lauffeldt (1747), will find the Guards no less glorious there than at our more world-famous defeat of Fontenoy, where the stubborn courage of the undaunted battalions drew from Marshal Saxe the frank acknowledgment that the troops with which he conquered could not have rivalled it. 'No reinforcements'—General Hamilton says, in telling the

crisis of the first action we have cited, a struggle fought on the very ground made classic in military history by the Archduke Charles's first feat in arms just a hundred years later—'arrived at this moment to second the Guards and Hanoverians. They were the same forces rallied that had the credit of regaining their former post and beating back their numerous enemies; the rest of the allied infantry were only sufficient to line the intrenchments, and no more battalions could be spared.' So at Almanza (the story of which is but hastily told in these volumes), we find the Guards abandoned by their Portuguese allies, and encompassed by a host of hostile cavalry flushed with victory, yet retreating steadily in unbroken squares across the wide plain in which Lord Galway had rashly exposed himself, nor yielding until their ammunition was totally exhausted and all hope of rescue lost. At Lauffeldt, again, they were left almost alone, just as at their first action, in the midst of the enemy's line; but more fortunate than at Dunkirk in the character of their enemies, they drew off after their retreating allies, without being surrounded as they might have been; their conduct extorting from Louis XV. who witnessed it, the well-known praise testified to by his prisoner, Sir John Ligonier, that the 'English not only pay for all, but fight for all.' Or, passing down the stream of British military history to seek its darkest portion in the campaigns in America, the conduct of the Guards, wherever engaged, proves that they carried the same high spirit across the Atlantic against the tough republican levies that Washington trained to conquer, as they had shown in Flanders and Bavaria and Spain against the greatest French generals of the earlier part of the century. They had scarcely joined Lord Cornwallis in his gallant effort to win back the Carolinas, when we find their general writing, 'We passed the Catawba on the 1st. The Guards behaved gallantly, and though they were fired upon during the whole time of their passing, never returned a shot until they got out of the river and formed.' Such coolness and discipline alone could have borne them through the terrible action, very terrible indeed for its dimensions, of Guildford, that followed not long after this passage. Of this battle an eye-witness quoted by General Hamilton writes with the strictest truth words which we are the more anxious to quote because many of our countrymen, who have spent admiration largely on General Sherman's exploits in this very district, are in perfect ignorance of the glorious feats of arms the little band of Cornwallis accomplished in the similar march of that great general from Charleston to Richmond.

'There is not perhaps,' says this writer in warm yet faithful language,  
VOL. CXL. NO. CCLXXXVI. I I

‘on the record of history an instance of a battle fought with more determined perseverance than was shown by the British troops on that memorable day. The battles of Cressy, Poitiers, and Agincourt, the glory of our own country and the admiration of ages, had in each of them, either from particular local situation, or other fortunate and favourable circumstances, something in a degree to counterbalance the disparity of numbers. Here time, place, and numbers all united against the British. The American general had chosen his ground, which was strong, commanding, and advantageous; he had time, not only to make his disposition, but to send away his baggage and every encumbrance. His cannon, and his troops, in numbers far exceeding the British, were drawn out in readiness to commence the action, when Lord Cornwallis approached to attack him.’

Or as General Hamilton less dramatically describes the close of the contest:—

‘The Guards and Hessians then again renewed the attack against the enemy’s third line, and eventually defeated it; but no sooner was this effected than they had to return to attack some more troops who appeared in their rear, and who were also finally driven off the field. The British showed great courage in this encounter; their numbers were only 1,445 against from 5,000 to 7,000 of the enemy, strongly posted; and it says much for the discipline of the Guards, that though on two separate occasions the two battalions were for a time thrown into confusion by an overpowering fire and superior numbers of the enemy, they were both rallied on the field of battle without retiring, and continued the attack till the enemy was finally defeated. The British lost nearly one-third of their numbers.’

We pass on to the close of the same century. The British are again in arms in Flanders to share the fleeting triumphs won by the Allies in the autumn of 1793, and the long train of disasters which followed their divided counsels in 1794, when Carnot hurled on them, with energy and decision, the rude but formidable levies of revolutionary France. The Guards had constant occasion during the former period to show that unshaken discipline which made their battalions bright exceptions to the low moral condition of the rest of the Duke of York’s English troops, and glorious opportunities in the latter to prove themselves worthy descendants of the men who fought for their king against all hope in their first action lost on the same frontier. The worst of these affairs was one of the earliest. The so-called battle of Turcoing, fought May 17, was in reality a series of severe skirmishes following some complicated movements ordered by the Emperor of Austria on the dangerous inspiration of Mack, the same officer who in later days lost him the flower of his army at Ulm. General Hamilton does not in the least exaggerate when he writes that, had the Austrians

been sworn enemies of the British instead of allies, they could not have devised combinations more likely to destroy them, nor carried them out in a manner more certain to lead to that result. So isolated and exposed to superior numbers was the column in which the Guards moved with another brigade of British infantry, that it is not too much to say that no ordinary troops could have extricated themselves from the position, and that it would have been impossible for even these to have escaped had the French around them possessed the experience of war they were yet to win, or their generals the skill they showed in after years under Napoleon. As it was, the Guards, cut off from their immediate support, and totally separated from the rest of the army, lost their guns, and retired, to find the only road for retreat strongly occupied. With the enemy pressing vigorously on in front and flank, they had to strike across the fields and fight their way out to a point of safety; a feat most gallantly accomplished, though with the loss of two hundred officers and men from their muster-roll. Constantly exposed during the dreary months of retreat that followed; as at Boxtel, where the conduct of the First Guards won special approval from Abercrombie, and where Wellesley first won distinction by his prompt support of them with his battalion when hard pressed, they endured unflinchingly and loyally the worst proofs that discipline and hunger can have to bear: and their light companies covered the painful retreat at its final close, when the Ems was crossed and Holland abandoned. Whatever trials future battles may have in store for them, it can bring none severer than those that fell to their share during those inglorious campaigns of York, the conduct of which may well be remembered as a warning by those who have most reason to be proud of the gallantry they called forth.

Twenty years elapsed, and found them once more in Flanders, an integral part of a great army fresh from Peninsular glories, and nerved as only soldiers are who have long followed a victorious chief. The unknown colonel of the 33rd, who had skilfully 'wheeled up his ranks' as the First Guards passed through them at Boxtel, and 'shattered with cool and 'well-directed volleys' the French hussars who were pressing on their rear, was now a renowned field-marshal, matched against the greatest general the world had ever produced. The decisive battle of Waterloo is so closely connected with the history of the regiment that it cannot be wholly omitted from our mention; but the episode which gave the corps the special title of 'The Grenadiers,' in memory of the overthrow of Napoleon's choicest veterans, is too threadbare a subject to



need dwelling on. We shall merely say that General Hamilton here deserves the highest praise as an annalist. In going over the ground of controversy between his own regiment and the 52nd, he does full justice to the former without depreciating the share taken by Colborne's glorious soldiers in the repulse of the last forlorn hope of the Empire. But those who really know the history of this battle are aware that the critical moment for Wellington was not at the desperate charge of the French Guards, but some hours before, when La Haye Sainte had been captured from us, and our centre was for a brief space laid bare. And the First Guards here performed a single-handed deed of arms, just at the time when many of their allies were most shaken, which is certainly as much to their credit as the famous charge they shared in later, and is but little known by comparison. We give it in General Hamilton's words:—

‘ Some French skirmishers were assembled under the shelter of some low ground west of the farm-house, who upon advancing from their comparative place of security were enabled to pour a flanking fire into the left flank of the third battalion First Guards, and the second battalion Ninety-fifth Rifles, a fire that became at last so serious that Maitland found it necessary to advance and dislodge them, and being himself in the square he gave directions to Lieutenant-Colonel D'Oyley, then in command of the Guards, to advance his men. The battalion was, as we have seen, in square, prepared to repel the repeated and constantly recurring attacks of the enemy's cavalry, who were still in the neighbourhood, at the foot of the slope, and it would have been hazardous under such circumstances to form line in the usual manner. The general, therefore, relying upon the steadiness of the men, merely directed the flank faces of the square to be thrown back in sections, and in that formation the third battalion advanced, being prepared to form square at the shortest notice. Though this forward and independent movement was necessary, it was not intended to be of long duration; but short as it was it at once attracted the notice of the batteries on the opposite hills, which, while the battalion was halted and firing into the skirmishers, mowed a passage two or three times through the faces of the square, the French cavalry on the right, at the time threatening another assault. Nothing daunted by this combined attack of the three arms of the enemy, the men, while continuing their fire with unshaken steadiness, closed up the gaps thus made in their ranks with promptitude and decision. Maitland having at last forced the enemy's infantry to retire, and finding the fire of their artillery too deadly to be longer resisted, if he remained thus in front of the general line of battle, ordered the battalion to retire about forty yards up the hill, which it did with the greatest coolness; nor did the French cavalry venture to attack it, either during the advance or during the subsequent return of the battalion over the brow of the hill to its original position, as it

would have done had any symptoms of unsteadiness been detected in the ranks of the British Guards.'

Yet 'not at Waterloo, nor in Carolina, nor on Fontenoy's bloody field; not even when, an untried battalion, they saw themselves abandoned on the Downs, did the ordeal of battle take a more dreadful form than on the cold November morning, when 60,000 Russians issued from the mist that shrouded Sebastopol to break through with one vigorous onset the lines drawn round their great fortress. The romance of war contains no tale more truly thrilling than the struggle which ensued, when 8,000 British infantry for hours met and repulsed the efforts of full fourfold their number of the brave enemies to wrest the key of the position from them. This strandedisproportion of the combatants, until Bosquet's French came in, is as clear as anything in history. In order to take it out of the region of absolute romance, it is necessary to remember two points which caused an otherwise overwhelming combination to end in disaster to the Russians. In the first place, their system of fighting in dense masses was peculiarly ill-adapted to force in the line of an enemy that could not be daunted by mere show of weight, and it of course narrowed their own front of fire, even more than the nature of the ground chosen for their attack. And in addition to this, the mistake of General Simonoff in directing his flanking column of 17,000 men, threw it across the head of Pauloff's troops advancing to the direct assault of the hill occupied by the Guards, and made it worse than useless for the combined movement which the two were to have carried out. General Hamilton treats this important episode in the history of the Grenadiers with his usual painstaking care. It must suffice us here to show from his narrative how their colours were saved at the most desperate hour of the conflict.

'A general forward movement of the Russians took place, their left advanced against the Guards in the Sand-bag battery, while the main body was directed against the centre of the second division. The officers commanding the Fusilier and Coldstream Guards perceiving that their left was being turned and their communication with the second division endangered, ordered their battalions to take ground to the left, and thus reached the ground to the right of the second division. The Grenadiers in the battery were now reduced, what with their losses in killed and wounded, by the advance of several detachments, and the absence of one company on picquet [that of Prince Edward of Saxe Weimar, which was separately and severely engaged], to little more than one hundred men. The thickness of the brushwood prevented the above flank movement of the Coldstreams and Fusiliers being seen by them, they were occupied in repelling the attacks of the enemy in front, when suddenly the Russians were seen coming down upon them from

the rear. The enemy who had advanced towards the second division, observing from the higher ground a body of British troops still in the Sand-bag battery, keeping at bay the Russians in their front, had wheeled round on their left, and were coming down in rear of the battery with the intention of taking the remainder of the Guards prisoners. There was nothing left for these to do but to rally round the colours for their protection, and charge through the advancing line in their rear, while those who still had ammunition left, kept up a fire on the enemy in their front. This charge was effected with perfect steadiness, and the head-quarters of the battalion were halted as soon as they reached the right of the second division breast-work. The French, who were now seen advancing to their support, were received by the Guards with an enthusiastic cheer, to which an equally warm response was given. The Duke of Cambridge came up at the same moment to this small band of Guardsmen, rejoicing to see the men and colours of the Grenadiers all safe, and was informed by the officer in command that though they had been surrounded, they had cut their way through again.'

We close with this scene our notice of these records. The Grenadier Guards have in the work before us a new source of pride; for if few regiments can rival them in the interest of their annals, none can boast of a history which has so thoroughly done justice to them. The whole execution of General Hamilton's work, in its laborious research, its fulness of illustration, and the completeness of its handsome form, bears testimony not merely to the spirit of the publisher, but the devotion of the author to this self-imposed duty. As he served his regiment with intelligence and energy in peace, and distinction in the field, so he has crowned his attachment to it by devoting the first years of leisure following a long term of military duty in every grade, to setting forth, in a manner that none shall mistake, its high claims to national respect. It is well that this should have been done by so competent a hand. Guardsmen do not always take the surest ground in their assertion of what is due to their cloth: for the best defence of any special privileges is to be found, not in general orders, nor even in time-measured prescription, but in going back to the past history which justifies these pretensions. The brigade in which General Hamilton was brought up needed some such apology, for it has been warmly attacked of late years, and has suffered some unfair obloquy, which the publication of these volumes will go far to remove.

Our duty would be incomplete did we not point out that the jealousy which has been manifested of its privileges was not founded, as some may think, on the petty military precedencies of the Guards, but was an inevitable consequence of the political changes in our constitution. Those who go deep

enough in the search for the cause may find it in the constant struggle carried on in this country for two generations past, between the great middle class gradually wresting the governing power from the aristocracy, and the latter seeking vainly to retain it. This struggle has made itself felt in every social circle, and in every national institution. It reached the army in due course, and the Guards, as the element allied closely to the less popular side, have naturally suffered in popular esteem. It has even been the fashion with a certain class of writers to depict their officers as carpet-knights, their ranks as full of pampered hirelings enlisted and paid as an expensive show. How far this is from being a truthful view, those best know who are most concerned with them in their character as soldiers. They would be found to-day, we are assured, under trial, what these volumes prove them from their first call to battle: ready to do and dare; as ready to endure; the flower now, as they have been the model, of the finest infantry that modern warfare has brought under arms.

ART. VIII.—*L'Antechrist*. Par ERNEST RENAN. Paris: 1873.

IT was, not long ago, a favourite notion of the Continental divines that the English Church had succumbed to so fatal a form of theological sterility, that she could do nothing more than produce an endless series of commentaries on the Apocalypse. Now we will not undertake to say that our Keiths, and Elliotts, and Cummings, and the host of minor luminaries who feebly glimmer in the 'Quarterly Journal of Prophecy,' have really been actuated by any rationalising or far-reaching views. It is rather to be feared that the predisposing cause of their diligent and moderately successful labours on the Apocalypse is to be sought in quite another direction; that they were possessed of certain views as to the plenary inspiration of every word and letter in the Holy Scriptures; and that their imagination, accordingly, was set on fire by the delusive hope of discovering in this sealed book a key to all history and a clue towards the solution of that insoluble problem—the future of the world and of the Church. It is however fairly open to us, now-a-days, to reply to our Continental censors that, in selecting the Apocalypse as the main subject of our theological labours, we were, after all, in the van and not in the rear of scientific research.\* We may have gone the wrong way to work. But, at any rate, we were already in

1729 on the right track; we had anticipated the direction in which the ablest and most advanced thinkers of a subsequent century would seek for full and sure information on some of the gravest problems of Christianity; and were earning the praise of one of the very foremost divines of modern Germany, who confesses that 'the earliest attempts at a thorough, searching inquiry into the Apocalypse are to be seen in the English Church at the beginning of the eighteenth century.'

The lead thus taken by England, however, has since been indifferently maintained. In biblical, if not in historical and philosophical, research we have been during the last half-century entirely outstripped by Germany; and in particular the Apocalyptic studies of Lücke, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Ebrard, and others have found as yet no rivals, or even imitators, in England. In France, on the contrary, in spite of the trammels by which Ultramontane or Protestant orthodoxy has repressed her theological activity, the spectacle of German industry has produced of late years some remarkable results. Reville, Nicolas, Reuss, and Coquerel have proved themselves no unworthy scholars of their Teutonic masters; and the fascinating pen of the great writer, whose latest work we propose to review in the present article, has perhaps commanded a wider attention, and achieved for him a more distinctly European reputation, than has been attained by any other representative of the modern school of theology, not excepting even the celebrated Dr. Strauss himself.

Yet M. Renan, though he is great in history, is hardly a historian; though he deals largely in criticism, he is hardly a critic; still less, though he much delights in theology, is he a theologian. He is, first and above all things, an artist. The skill with which he can weave together—out of legends, inscriptions, memoranda of travels, scraps from the Talmud, coins, regular histories, fragments of all sorts—a consecutive and beautiful narrative, is really beyond all praise. No reader can fail to be carried along with the current of his ideas. And if occasionally a mawkish piece of sentiment or an awkward avowal of unbelief occur to ruffle our too placid concurrence, yet after all we resign ourselves to the interruption, as we should welcome the changeful humours of some wayward stream, and confess that, artistically, the effect is enhanced and not spoiled by a little break of continuity. But then it must be remembered that, with all the striking beauties and graces of a consummate artist, M. Renan also combines the faults and weaknesses which beset all artistic representation. Artistic truth is subjective rather than objective. It seeks to

throw the mind into a certain state. It is therefore careless of presenting the precise facts of the outer world as they really are, in their somewhat chaotic and prosaic incoherence. It groups, it 'composes,' it extends, it concentrates, it gives a meaning of its own to what it sees; in short, it is not photography, but painting; it is not imitation, but art. And therefore, while we accept with the utmost gratitude, and read with the keenest pleasure, such works as these, we can never remind ourselves too often that they present but one *phase* of the many-sided truth, and that they no more exhaust the subject they profess to handle than Miss Thompson's picture exhausts the subject of the Crimean War, or than Bach's 'Passions-musik' says all that can be said on the Passion of our Lord.

The present work, with its characteristically mis-spelt title—the Athenians and the Parisians have, alone among mankind, claimed to adapt the orthography of all nations to the exigencies of their own organs—'L'Antechrist,' forms in reality the fourth volume of a series. 'The History of the Origin of Christianity' is the running title of the whole series. The first volume contained the celebrated 'Life of Jesus;' the second was occupied with 'the Apostles' and the infant Church; the third was entitled 'St. Paul;' the fourth is now before us, and might almost have been entitled 'St. John;' and a fifth volume is yet to come, on 'The last Survivors of the Apostolic Age.' Among all these volumes we unhesitatingly assign the palm to the second, on 'The Apostles.' But it is impossible to deny that the volume before us is also a work of the very highest interest and importance, and that it sets forth the results which have been attained, especially by German research, in the history of the Church under Nero, with a vividness quite unequalled, and in that particular part of Church-history absolutely unexpected.

For if there were any period given up by universal consent as a dark and inexplicable transition-time—a tunnel (as it has been described) into which the train plunges, to emerge again a mile farther on—that period was the time which intervened between the latest events recorded in the Acts of the Apostles and the first opening of regular Church-literature in the Apostolical Fathers. The composition of the four Gospels and of the so-called Pastoral Letters, is indeed usually attributed to this period. But even then, such writings as these throw little light on the times in which they were being written; the Gospel narratives being histories wholly concerned with the past, and these epistles being in great measure of a merely hortatory and practical cast. But what if a work of that

period, long known yet wrapped in profoundest obscurity, should suddenly emerge into full daylight—a book not only written at the time in question, but written by one of the foremost men of the time; not only breathing in every page the most intense convictions and passions of the contemporary Church, but also offering the strangest points of conjunction with the strangest passages of secular history; and not only capable of being dated within wide limits of a century or a decennium, but traceable with certainty to a year, to a month, and almost to a day,—would not such a book as this be indeed accounted worthy of the profoundest study, and be regarded by all thoughtful men as a historical treasure of inestimable value and interest?

Such a book we have. It has been borne down to us safely from those far-off times—though with many a flaw and mark of rough usage and of hopeless misunderstanding—owing to its reputed apostolic authorship and its consequent asylum among the venerated books of Holy Scripture. It is, in short, the Apocalypse of St. John.

Whether indeed it be really by St. John is a point on which critics have been much exercised from the age of Dionysius of Alexandria, in the third century, down to our own. But the difficulties as to its authorship are almost entirely of an internal character. And they are based on two postulates, neither of which is nearly so certain as the well-attested fact which they are employed to contravene. The first objection is that, Millennial doctrines being false, the book which contains them cannot possibly be written by one of the twelve Apostles; the second is that, the fourth Gospel being certainly by St. John, a book whose ideas and style are so entirely different cannot have proceeded from the same hand. But in opposition to this there stands the clear external testimony of all the earliest and most trustworthy writers that this book is by St. John—a testimony (as it happens) more unanimous and more absolutely convincing than can be adduced in favour of the apostolic authorship of any other book of the New Testament.\* And therefore we are driven to the precisely opposite conclusions, namely (1) that such Millennial doctrines as are to be found in the Apocalypse really do belong to apostolic times; (2) that, if the style and contents of the fourth Gospel cannot be reconciled with those of the Apocalypse, it is the fourth Gospel whose authorship must remain in doubt, and not the Apoca-

---

\* This is pointed out by Mede, 'Works,' iii. 747; and by Bishop Wordsworth, 'On Apocalypse,' p. 87.

lypse. We cannot therefore agree with M. Renan in thinking that the true writer of the book was some companion, or secretary, or disciple, to whose work the Apostle afterwards good-naturedly lent the weight of his name. Still less can we agree with Ewald, who, following the patristic objectors, attributes the work to that shadowy, half-mythical personage, the Presbyter John of Ephesus. Least of all can we agree with those who, like Caius and others in the third century, venture to assign its composition to the heresiarch Cerinthus, the Gnostic opponent of St. John. Rather we give our full assent to the arguments of Lücke, Ebrard, and a host of other critics, who maintain that there is no sufficient reason to doubt that the traditional authorship of this book is the true one.

But if so, important consequences immediately ensue. For the next stage of inquiry into the contents of this curious relic of apostolic times leads our author to conclusions of a remarkable and interesting kind. In the first place, to quote the words of M. Renan, there is no doubt that

‘The book is Judæo-Christian, Ebionite. It is the work of an enthusiast, transported with hatred against the Roman Empire and the profane world. It excludes all hope of reconciliation between Christianity on the one hand, and the Empire and the world on the other. Its Messianic conceptions are wholly material. The reign of the martyrs for a thousand years is affirmed. The end of the world is announced as imminent. These views, in which the more rational Christians, obeying the direction of St. Paul and afterwards that of the Alexandrian School, saw nothing but difficulties, appear to us the guarantee of primitive and apostolic authorship. . . . Chimæras, impossibilities, materialist conceptions, paradoxes, enormities—such as tried the patience of Eusebius when he read the ancient Ebionite and Millenarian authors, (Papias, &c.)—these were the true “Primitive Christianity.” And in order that the dreams of these transcendent seers should become a religion capable of life, it was necessary that their work should be taken in hand by men of sense and genius—such as were the Greek converts of the third century—and that by them it should be modified, corrected, and pruned. But in that very process, these authentic monuments of the *naïvetés* of an earlier age soon became embarrassing witnesses, whose testimony must somehow be cast into the shade. And so that happened—which almost always happens at the first appearance of new religious creations, and which especially marked the first days of the Franciscan Order—the founders of the house were evicted by the new-comers, and the true successors of the earliest Fathers presently became suspected, if not attainted, of heresy.’ (P. xxxix.)

Some of the language here used is, no doubt, too strong and unguarded. But on the whole we believe that what M. Renan means to say is not far from the truth. He means



that all great and powerful religious movements have sprung from the people, and have appealed at first to the popular feelings and imagination; and it is not till a later period that the clarifying processes of the colder intellect have begun. First come the *Vedas*, and then the *Puranas* or theological commentaries upon them. First come the Wesleyan 'convulsions' or the Irvingite 'tongues,' and then follow calm and rational efforts to assign a meaning to these things and to found permanent societies upon them. That this was the case too, on the largest scale, with Christianity can hardly be doubted by anyone who will take the trouble to read the Acts and the Epistles distinctly as history and not as theology, and will carefully observe the 'behaviour' (as a chemist would say) of the Gospel leaven when it was fairly brought into contact with the world. Contrast, for instance, the tone and the contents of the (so called) Synoptical Gospels with those of the fourth Gospel. In the one case we have the discrepancies and unavoidable confusions of an oral narrative; in the other we find theology, reflections upon that narrative. In the one we have crude material; in the other form and purpose are manifest. And we see, accordingly, in St. John a sevenfold collection of typical miracles, two great cycles of discourse upon the Water and the Blood, and an Alexandrian Logos-philosophy applied to solve the ever-deepening, ever-reopening question, 'Whom say ye that I am?' Or watch, again, the unfolding of the drama of the Acts. Here we find, first, the confused and (apparently) inexplicable Pentecostal scene; and, thereupon, St. Peter's attempt to explain the phenomena of that scene, by attaching them to his hearers' existing notions about Old Testament prophecy; by showing that, after all, these events were no more than an intelligent reader ought to have been prepared for, and by proclaiming that they were, in short, nothing else than a revival, under new forms, of the ancient and venerable spirit of prophecy, no longer confined to a select few, but endemic among the congregation. Or study, once more, the demeanour of the infant Church in view of that, at first sight, paradoxical and astounding spectacle, the all but unanimous refusal of the Jewish race—after whole centuries of divine training and *propædeia*—to accept their Messiah when He came. At the outset there was nothing for it but to recognise this fact and honestly to face it. But very soon a theory was found to fit it. And from our Lord's lips was eagerly borrowed a quotation (Isaiah xxix. 10) which showed that this too was no more than Bible-readers ought to have expected; while St. Paul spends whole chapters of his Epistle to the

Romans in expanding a similar thought, viz. that God's procedure had always been by a system of 'selection' (*ἐκλογή*), and of 'remnants' (*λείμματα*); and that therefore the present difficulty was really the reverse of a 'difficulty,' being all of a piece with God's ways from Genesis to Malachi. Or, lastly—not to weary the reader with too many evidences of an undeniable truth—contrast the tone and 'animus' of the earliest Epistles of Paul, written to the Thessalonians (about A.D. 50), with the later productions of his pen, Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians (about A.D. 63). In the former we seem to breathe a spirit analogous to that of the Apocalypse. It is not reasoning that we meet with there, but chaotic feelings and ardent hopes. But in the later Epistles, on the contrary, theory and intellectual reflection have made their appearance. Christ, who previously had been conceived of—in true Jewish form—as about to return immediately, with concomitants such as those we meet with in the Revelation of St. John, has in these later letters been reverently submitted to intellectual scrutiny. The best philosophical ideas of the time have been employed to explain His nature and His relations to the universe. And He is no longer merely the 'Lord descending from heaven' 'with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God,' but he has become the ideal centre and rallying-point 'of all things in heaven and earth,' the 'fulness of Him that filleth all in all,' the visible 'image of the invisible God,' the creator of all things, 'in the form of God,' 'equal with God.'

Such, we undertake to say, have been the first two providential stages in the growth of every religion which has had sufficient truth and fibre in it to seize the popular heart and to live. And such, accordingly, were the first two steps in the progress of Christianity, whose especial glory it is, not to be unnatural, but to be a consecration and transfiguration of the natural. We not only accept, therefore, M. Renan's theory about the polemical purpose of the Apocalypse, but we accept it cordially and as a matter of course. We have not a word to say against it. On the contrary, it seems to us—especially when worked out with his admirable industry and presented in full historical detail—to reflect a great deal of light on analogous cases, where detail is perhaps wanting, or where the diligence of critics has been more at fault.

Now the truth of this modern theory about the Apocalypse almost wholly hinges upon the truth of its assigned date. And the arguments which support the assignment of A.D. 68 as the date of its composition appear to us to be absolutely irresistible.

In the first place, there can be no question that some terrible and bloody persecution had lately happened. For chapter vii. 14 mentions 'a great multitude, which no man could number, with palms in their hands, . . . which came out of *great tribulation*, and have washed their robes and made them white in 'the blood of the Lamb;' and chapter xvii. 6 says, 'I saw the woman drunken with the *blood of the saints*, and with the *blood of the martyrs of Jesus*;' and chapter xx. 4 speaks of 'them that were *beheaded* for the witness of Jesus.' But the first persecution on any large scale took place under Nero, in A.D. 64. Again, there can be little doubt that Jerusalem was still standing when the author wrote, although it seems to be already seriously threatened by the Gentile armies. 'There was given unto me,' says he, 'a reed like unto a rod: and the angel stood, saying, "Rise and measure the temple of God and the altar and them that worship therein. But the court, which is without the temple, leave out and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles, and they shall tread it under foot forty-and-two months."' But Jerusalem was taken by the Gentiles, and the temple (not merely the outer precincts) was utterly destroyed, in A.D. 70. Within the six years, therefore, that intervened between A.D. 64 and A.D. 70 the Apocalypse must certainly have been written.

But even this narrow margin can, on further investigation, be reduced within still narrower limits. For one passage in this curious book—this 'open secret,' which seems to whisper to us (as St. Matthew also does), 'let him that readeth understand'—is evidently meant to give the precise chronological clue which we are in search of. *It furnishes St. John's own information as to the exact time at which he was writing.* The passage in question occurs in chapter xvii., where the vision of the scarlet woman riding on the beast with seven heads and ten horns is thus quite intelligibly explained:—

'Upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the great. . . . And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the Saints and with the blood of the Martyrs of Jesus. . . . And the angel said unto me: I will tell thee the mystery of the woman and of the beast that carrieth her, . . . the beast that was, and is not, and yet is. Here is the mind that hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven and goeth unto perdition. And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings; which have received no kingdom as yet, but receive power as kings one hour with the beast. These have one mind, and shall give their

power and strength unto the beast. These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for He is Lord of Lords and King of Kings. . . . And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth.'

We have transcribed this curious passage in full because of the singular certainty with which its riddles can be deciphered, and because of the remarkable interest and importance of its contents. The 'woman' is clearly the great imperial city of Rome. Five of the emperors have already fallen; viz. Augustus,\* Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero. *The sixth, Galba, 'now is,' and under his nine months' reign, therefore, the author was writing his book:* (May 1, A.D. 68—January 15, A.D. 69.) But Galba was an old man, and the world was full of bloodshed and revolt. A successor was soon to be looked for, whether Otho or Vitellius or some other, whom military violence would be sure to set up. And when he came, he too would 'continue but a short space.' And then, O horror! the BEAST, the hateful, blood-stained persecutor, would come back again and occupy his godless throne once more. He would come up from the sea. He would land from some foreign parts—no doubt from the East. Ten would-be kings (whether Parthian chieftains or upstart generals) in full revolt and burning hatred against the Roman senate, would support the revival of this long-vanished claimant's title to his abandoned throne. Yes: the rumour of his death was, no doubt, a mere invention. He would establish himself once more. He would rank as the 'eighth' emperor. And then would come the apparent triumph of all evil, the temporary victory of Antichrist, and of all that was most opposite to the pure and heavenly Christ; a victory, however, to be quickly followed by the return of Christ Himself in power and glory, and by the final 'putting 'of all things—even of Death itself—under His feet.'

And what then is the *name* of this returning Antichrist? Chapter xiii. 18 shall answer this question for us: 'Here is 'wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number 'of the beast; for it is the number of a man: and his number 'is six hundred three score and six.' In other words, his name is NERO. For this name, when written down as it was well known by sight to all the provincials on their coins and standards and inscriptions—*Νέρων Καίσαρ*, or נֶרֶן קֶסֶר, if each Hebrew letter is given its proper numerical value, amounts precisely to 666. •

---

\* Ewald, 'On Apoc.' p. 5: 'Augustus was rightly reckoned, especially in Palestine, as the first Roman Emperor.'

And now add to all these remarkable coincidences the circumstance recorded for us by Tacitus and other heathen historians, viz. that Nero's disappearance was in fact so sudden, and his death witnessed by so few persons, that vague rumours very soon got abroad that he was not dead at all, but that he had slipped away from his enemies, had conveyed himself secretly to the East, and was preparing for a speedy return at the head of terrible Parthian auxiliaries and disaffected Roman generals, to reconquer Rome and to inaugurate afresh the horrible tragi-comedy of his former reign. Naturally there were not wanting impostors in abundance to take advantage of this delusion. Pretenders and Perkin Warbecks soon sprang up in all directions, especially in the credulous East, who gave themselves out as 'Nero redivivus.' We hear of them even so late as twenty years farther on, in the reign of Domitian, when the empire had been thoroughly re-established under the Flavian dynasty. But, of course, at an earlier time, when Nero's disappearance was a recent event, these mock-Neros would be far more numerous, and would attract a much more serious and anxious attention. And accordingly Tacitus informs us that 'about this time [i. e. about the end of Galba's reign], Achaia and Asia were terrified by the false news that "Nero was coming," there being various rumours afloat concerning his death, and many people being of opinion (or pretending to be so) that he was still alive. The adventures and attempts of other impostors shall be described farther on. But just at this time a slave from Pontus—or, as others said, a freedman from Italy—skilful in playing the lyre and in singing, (a skill which, added to some personal resemblance, made the imposture easier,) embarked with some deserters whom he found wandering about with empty pockets, and whom he drew to his side by enormous promises. Driven by violent tempests to the island of Cythnos [an Ægean island directly opposite to Patmos], he found some soldiers there on furlough from the East; and, cutting short all refusals with the sword, added them to his force. He then plundered the merchants and armed all the able-bodied slaves. At length, on attempting with various artifices to shake the fidelity of a certain Sisenna, a centurion on his way home with symbols of fraternisation from the Syrian army to the Prætorian troops [at Rome], Sisenna, seized with panic and fearing for his life, escaped secretly from the island. And then terror spread far and wide—some being thrown into excitement by the celebrity of the name [Nero], others by hoping to fish in troubled waters, and others by sheer discon-

'tent with the present state of affairs. At last a happy accident brought all these daily-growing rumours to an end.\*'

We have quoted this curious passage from Tacitus at full length that our readers may see for themselves how precisely it suits, and therefore how accurately it dates, the corresponding chapters of the Apocalypse. And no reasonable man, we think, can doubt that here we have the true key to the interpretation of a book so often given up, as a hopeless child's puzzle, to childish handling. And if so, then once more has bold criticism deserved well of the Church; for it has once more—as in the well-known case of the four unassailable Epistles of St. Paul—supplied a solid historical basis to a literary relic of the Apostolic age, given positive certainty to its very early date, and restored to its honoured place amid the Church's unquestioned archives an invaluable specimen, not now of the Pauline or Hellenic, but of the anti-Pauline and Hebraic, type of early Christian teaching.

It is precisely this Hebraic department of the Church's literature which (it so happens) has become just now of unusual interest and importance. For there is no question that the earliest Christian Church was a Hebrew Church. There is also no question that it was an offset from this Hebrew Church which planted itself with exceptional vigour at Rome; and that hence Roman Christianity, from that time to this, has been strongly tinctured with Jewish elements, has blazed with Jewish intolerance, delighted in Jewish gorgeousness, and fallen a victim to Jewish realism; while Pauline or Augustinian or Protestant idealism has struggled manfully indeed, but too often in vain, to overcome the dead weight of these lower ingredients in Catholic Christianity, and to assert for intelligence and freedom their true place in the Church. That this struggle of the Petrine and Pauline elements in Christianity is still going on under our eyes, as it has been going on in all ages, need not be said. But it is essential to the healthy solution of the problem that both views should be clearly understood. The lower, sensuous, realistic Roman type of churchmanship cannot be thoroughly understood without an understanding of the early Hebrew Christianity out of which it took its rise. Would anyone, therefore, see how much, and how little, Romanism has to say for itself, let him go to the Holy Scriptures, and, putting aside their Pauline ingredients

---

\* Tacitus, 'Hist.' ii. 8: the same curious forebodings may be seen in Dio Cassius, lxiv. 9: in the 'Sibylline Verses,' bk. iv. line 117: and in Commaidon, Instructio 41, 'De tempore Antichristi.'

(St. Luke and the Acts and St. Paul's Epistles), he will then find that he has left upon his hands (1) the Jewish Old Testament complete; (2) the literalism of St. Matthew and St. Peter; (3) the sacramental mysticism of St. John; (4) the ascetic moralism of St. James and St. Jude; (5) the gorgeous ritualism of the Apocalypse; and out of these Hebrew materials he might perhaps be able to construct, in its main features, the Roman system of religion. Re-introduce, however, St. Paul, and all this wonderful phantasmagoria begins to break up. Its unity and completeness is troubled. Pauline freedom, individualism, and intelligence, entering into combination with the previous Hebraizing ingredients, produce that vivacious and wholesome effervescence which we see going on at this hour in all countries where Christianity is really alive, and where the Scriptures in their completeness are really studied.

As for the Apocalypse, its thoroughly Hebrew and anti-Pauline character is manifest on a very slight scrutiny. In the first place, the name of St. Paul never once occurs throughout its pages. But the *person* of St. Paul is, in all probability, introduced, and that under the mystical and uncomplimentary pseudonym of Balaam, 'who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to 'idols' (ii. 14), which is just what St. Paul did teach his converts to do (see Romans xiv. 14; 1 Corinthians x. 27). And again probably the same apostle is aimed at under the analogous Greek name of 'Nicolaus.' Thou hast tried them,' writes St. John to the Church at Ephesus, 'which say they 'are apostles and are not. Thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate' (ii. 2-6); a passage which receives much light from another Judæo-Christian work of the following century, the *Clementine Homilies*, in which St. Paul is covertly attacked under the pseudonym of Simon Magus. 'Some 'people,' says St. Peter in this curious romance, 'from among 'the Gentiles have rejected my lawful teaching, being led 'away by the lawless and worthless doctrine of a certain 'enemy. . . . And sayest thou, our Jesus appeared to thee in 'vision, and was known to and conversed with thee? It was 'in wrath, as to an opponent. . . . As if anyone by visions 'can be instructed so as to be a teacher! And if thou sayest, "he can," why (I pray) did the Master for a whole year 'abide and converse with us, while in full possession of our 'senses? . . . And if thou, by being seen and taught of Him 'during one hour, becamest an "Apostle," do not contend 'with me His companion! For thou didst "withstand me to

“the face” as though I “was to be blamed.” Now these last are the very words which, in Galatians ii. 11, describe St. Paul’s conduct at Antioch; and there can be no doubt whatever that here, at any rate, we have a covert attack on St. Paul. The probability, therefore, becomes great that—from amid the far more stormy passions of an earlier period (about A.D. 68), and on the morrow of that very opposition of the Jewish party which dogged his footsteps from city to city and ‘preached Christ of envy and strife’—we have here in the Apocalypse a decently concealed attack on the party of freedom and on St. Paul, the active and (as it seemed) unscrupulous favourer of Gentile laxity. If so, M. Renan may not be very far from the truth when he writes as follows:—

‘Religious fanaticism very often produces in the same person the most opposite phenomena of hardness and softness of heart. Many an inquisitor, in the middle ages, who burnt hundreds of poor wretches for some insignificant subtleties, was at the same time the most gentle and (in a sense) the most humble of men. Now it was against the little conventicles of that man’s disciples whom people were calling the new Balaam, that the animosity of John and his *entourage* appears to have been keen and profound. Such injustice belongs to all partisans; and such passion inflamed these strong Jewish natures, that in all probability the final disappearance of the “destroyer of the law” was hailed with cries of joy by his adversaries, to many of whom the death of this damper to their success, this troubler to their serenity, must have been a veritable relief. We have seen that Paul at Ephesus felt himself surrounded with enemies. His last discourses in Asia are full of sad presentiments. And at the beginning of the year 69, we shall find the hatred which attached to him still keenly alive. After that the controversy will be calmed, and silence will reign around his memory. At the moment with which we are concerned, no one appears to have taken his part; and it is just that fact which, later on, saved his cause. The reserve, or perhaps the weakness, of his partisans brought on a reconciliation. For even the most advanced ideas end by becoming accepted, if only they have patience enough to undergo for a long time in silence the objections of their conservative opponents.’ (P. 348.)

But it was not against any internal enemy that the thunders of the Apocalypse were really, or at least mainly, directed. A mere heresy within the Church demanded but a cursory attention. A discredited and almost abandoned pseudo-apostle needed no more than a passing sword-stroke. The direct and furious onslaught of the violent and concentrated hate which breathes through this book of the only surviving ‘son of thunder’ was aimed at what then seemed a far more threatening and powerful foe, viz. at ruthless, pagan, imperial ROME.

For, in point of fact, the old burning question, which had



gone on blazing and then smouldering again for centuries, had now at last flamed up into a conflagration only comparable to that which shall, at the last day, embrace the whole world. The blazing question was this:—*Should, or should not, God's own people succumb finally beneath the heel of a heathen and blaspheming world?* Let the reader only endeavour to place himself in imagination in the position of a Hebrew Christian, full of patriotism, steeped in Old Testament lore, schooled—not by St. Paul but—by the Targumists and the Rabbis whose teaching is echoed for us in the Talmud, and influenced by constant handling of such books as Daniel, Esdras, Enoch, and (it may be) the verses of the Judæan Sibyl; then let him conceive the time to be precisely the epoch between the almost maddening scenes of Nero's frightful persecution and the still more horrible scenes that accompanied the destruction of Jerusalem; and he will find less difficulty than he ever found before, not only in accounting for, but even in clearly understanding, the impassioned pages of the Apocalypse. First of all, he would have fully in remembrance that glorious passage of the nation's annals which seems to have left an indelible expectation of miraculous deliverance upon every Jewish mind—the destruction of Pharaoh's host in the Red Sea. 'The Song of Moses' and 'the Song of the Lamb,'\* the triumph over Pharaoh and the triumph over Antichrist, would thus be inseparably linked together, as the beginning and the end of Jewish history, in his mind. And he would gather, from so marvellous an introduction of his chosen race upon the theatre of the world, the absolute certainty of a similar miraculous deliverance, 'if it should prove necessary, from the brute force of the heathen empire before the consummation of all things should come. Next the thought of David and Solomon would occur, with their conquests over the surrounding nations, and the popular elevation of David to a pedestal of eternal honour as the hero-saint of the Jewish race and the type of a still greater Messiah (that is, a 'consecrated person,' a religious deliverer), who was yet to come. Was not Hezekiah, too, miraculously delivered, even in his utmost straits? Did not Cyrus set the chosen people free from Babylon, without the need of lifting so much as a finger in their own behalf? Had not Judas Maccabæus broken in pieces the iron rod of the accursed Epiphanes, and abundantly justified the glorious hopes which 'the Book of Daniel' had then awakened in all men's breasts? Now that Rome was the oppressor, now that

---

\* See Rev. xv. 3.

'Esau' (the Idumæan Herods and their Sadducee supporters) had betrayed the nation into alien and pagan hands—nay, when Nero, the thrice-accursed persecutor of God's people, had perpetrated his horrible and unmentionable cruelties upon the saints, would not the bright forecasts of the Apocalypse, of Esdras, of Enoch, of the Sibyl, at last come true; and perhaps after some crowning enormity of successful tyranny and lawlessness, would not 'Nero redux' too—like Pharaoh and all his host—be smitten to the earth by the Messiah returning in His glory?

That such were the thoughts stirring in the breast of the Seer of Patmos there can be no doubt whatever. 'The Book of Daniel' was much in his mind; as is clear from a score of passages, but especially from the expression (in Rev. xiii. 5) 'forty and two months,' a period of three years and a half, which verbally coincides with the 'time, times, and a half' of Dan. xii. 7. The 'Sibylline Verses,' in their original form, were also probably known to him. These were the work of an Alexandrian Jew, about B.C. 150; and they were occupied with the same great problem, 'when and how should the kingdom of God appear?' The answer given by this pretended wife of Noah—for all the earlier Apocalyptic literature is pseudonymous and claims a primæval antiquity—is virtually as follows:—'When Rome shall have succeeded in destroying the last vestiges of Alexander's Empire (the "fourth empire" of Daniel,) by annexing Egypt, then "the reign of the Eternal King shall appear unto men." But ere long Belial shall come, destroying far and wide, and performing many miracles. At length, God shall send a king from the East, to put down war and fill the earth with good. The heathen kings shall gather against him, and shall even besiege the holy city. But God shall send fiery swords from heaven, and burning torches, and shall suddenly destroy them. And then the judgment-day shall come, and the reign of God.\* A third work often in the Seer's hands was the celebrated 'Book of Enoch,' which was also used by St. Jude. This strange book was composed in the first century before Christ; and it contains such passages as the following:—'In that day the Elect One shall sit upon a throne of glory; and shall choose their conditions and countless habitations. In that day I will cause my Elect One to dwell in the midst of them; I will change the face of the heavens. . . I will also change the face of the earth.' 'That tree of an agreeable smell there shall be no power to touch,

---

\* Cf. 'Sibylline Verses,' bk. iii. lines 652, &c. : and 766, &c.

'until the period of the great judgment. When all shall be punished and consumed for ever, then shall this be bestowed on the righteous and humble. The fruit of this tree [of life] shall be given to the elect.' 'At that time I beheld the Ancient of days, while he sat upon the throne of His glory, while the book of the living was opened in His presence. . . . In that hour was this Son of man invoked before the Lord of Spirits, and his name in the presence of the Ancient of days. Before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of heaven were formed, his name was invoked in the presence of the Lord of spirits.' 'In that day shall all the kings, the princes, the exalted, and those who possess the earth stand up; . . . trouble shall come upon them, as upon a woman in travail. . . . Trouble shall seize them, when they behold this Son of woman sitting upon the throne of his glory.\* Lastly, there can be little doubt that the 'Fourth Book (or Apocalypse) of Esdras' was in the Seer's remembrance. For this work too was busied with the same eternal problem,—How *can* it be that the Law and the Prophets and the mighty deliverances of old seem all in vain, and that God's chosen people is hopelessly subjected to Idumæan Herods and to Pagan Rome? And the answer given is precisely that given also by St. John. The tyranny of Rome is the worst and the last tyranny. And when Rome falls, the kingdom of God shall presently appear.† In short, to use the words of M. Renan :

'The time had now gone by when Paul and perhaps Peter had preached submission to the Roman dominion, and had even attributed to that dominion a character almost divine. The principles of the fanatic Jews who refused tribute, traced all secular power to a diabolic source, and scented idolatry in the commonest acts of civil life under its Roman forms, had carried the day. Such was the natural consequence of persecution. Moderate principles had ceased to be applicable. And without being so violent as in A.D. 64, the persecution went on by its own momentum. Asia was the province where the downfall of Nero had caused the greatest sensation; the general opinion being that the monster, healed by some satanic power, was hidden in obscurity and was about to reappear. And one may easily conceive what effect such rumours would produce among the Christians, many of whom at Ephesus—their great apostle perhaps among the number—had themselves escaped from the grand butchery of A.D. 64. "What! the horrible BEAST, that incarnation of luxury, of fatuity, of vain glory, to reappear! The thing is clear. Even those must now be convinced, who before were sceptical about Nero being Antichrist. Here he is—this mystery of iniquity, this antipodes of Jesus—who must appear to assas-

\* Cf. 'Enoch,' ch. 45, 24, 47, 61.

† 'Esdras,' xi. 40.

"sinate, to martyrise the world, before the dawning of the great day." These views were the more readily adopted by the Christians, inasmuch as the death of Nero had been too commonplace to suit such an Antiochus as he. Persecutors of this class had a habit of perishing with more *éclat*. And the natural conclusion was, that this enemy of God was reserved for a more tragical fate, which should be inflicted on him in presence of the whole world and of the angels, assembled by the Messiah. This idea, parent of the Apocalypse, took day by day more definite forms. . . . The form of an "Apocalypse" at length chosen by our author was not new in Israel. Ezekiel had already inaugurated a considerable change in the old style of prophecy; and, in a certain sense, one may regard him as the creator of Apocalyptic literature. Instead of ardent preaching, accompanied sometimes by symbolical actions of an extremely simple kind, he had introduced (no doubt, under the influence of Assyrian art) the method of *Visions*—that is to say, a complicated system of allegory, wherein abstract ideas were realised by means of chimerical creatures of an impossible kind. Zechariah had continued in the same line; and "visions" had become the recognised and regular method of prophetic teaching. Ultimately, the author of "the Book of Daniel," by the extraordinary popularity which he attained, fixed for good the rules of this style; and "the Book of Enoch," the "Assumption of Moses," and certain "Sibylline Poems," were the result of the powerful impetus then given.' (Pp. 350, 357.)

But was this hatred of the Roman empire well founded? Was this horror at the impending return of Nero a reasonable and a Christian feeling? M. Renan is inclined to think that it was exaggerated; and that the author's Jewish exclusiveness was partly due to the inability which members of small religious and trading communities always feel to comprehend great military states.

'A less agreeable trait was that sombre hatred of the profane world, which our author had in common with all the Apocalyptic writers, and especially with the writer of "the Book of Enoch." His rudeness, his passionate and unjust invectives against Roman society, are shocking; and they justify to a certain extent those who characterised the new doctrine as a "hatred of the whole human race." The poor virtuous man is always tempted to regard the world which he knows not as more wicked than it really is. The crimes of the rich and courtly classes appear to him singularly gross. And that kind of virtuous fury which, four centuries later, possessed the Vandals against civilisation, was felt by Jews of the prophetic and apocalyptic schools in the very highest degree. One recognises among them a trace of the ancient nomad spirit, a spirit whose ideal was the patriarchal system, and which cherished a profound aversion for great cities as foci of corruption, and a burning jealousy against powerful states founded on a military principle which they themselves were unable, or unwilling, to accept. Thus the Apocalypse became, in many respects, a dangerous book, the extreme expression of Jewish pride.' (P. 474.)

Yet even M. Renan himself is obliged to confess that the moral decadence of the heathen world, especially at that *colluvies omnium gentium*, the metropolis of the whole Empire, had now reached a pitch of tragic horror, such as the world had never seen before. It may be true that pure and virtuous homes were yet to be found in many a sequestered village, or even among the 'dusky lanes and wrangling marts' of the great cities. It certainly is true that, in refined and philosophic circles, a few individuals were raised by their philosophy and by the aversion with which the 'drunken Helots' all around inspired them, far above the festering mass. But if we are to believe a tithe of the stories collected by Suetonius, if we are to credit in any way the almost contemporary satires of Juvenal, if we are to listen to the noble protests of Tacitus, to read for ourselves the disgusting revelations of Apuleius, to cull at random among the 'Sibylline Verses,' to ask the meaning of the first chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and to study the not much later descriptions of Justin Martyr and Tertullian, we are driven to the conviction that heathen society was in the first century rotten to its very core, that the lower classes were absolutely steeped in vices of the most revolting description, and that the horrible crimes which came to the light of day in the higher and governing classes were but the more luxuriant fruit of the poison-tree whose roots were wrapped round the whole world. No wonder that the better sort of heathens were in a state of eager and almost despairing expectancy of something better. No wonder that Greek and Roman ladies were attracted by the superior purity of Judaism. No wonder that Christians, like the writer of the Apocalypse, saw in Nero—the bloodstained, infamous, popular favourite—Antichrist incarnate, or indulged in passionate hatred, not indeed 'of the human race,' but of a portentous evil which had gained possession of the human race.

'The moral, social, and political situation grew worse every day. Rumours of prodigies and calamities filled the air; and the Christians were more eagerly interested in such things than anyone else. The notion that Satan is the god of this world became more and more a fixed idea with them. The public spectacles appeared to them demoniacal. It is true they never went there; but they heard of them from those who went. In particular, an "Icarus" who in the wooden amphitheatre of the Campus Martius had attempted to fly through the air, and who had fallen on the very stall of Nero himself and had spattered him with gore, struck them profoundly and became the leading incident in one of their legends. The crimes of Rome had reached the extremest limits of an infernal sublimity; and it was already a habit of the sect—whether as a precaution against the police or through a

liking for mystery—to designate this city by the name of Babylon. . . . During the first thirty years which elapsed since the first preaching of Christianity the Jews alone had hindered the work of Jesus. The Romans had defended the Christians against the Jews. But now the Romans, in their turn, had become the persecutors; and from the capital these terrors and these hatreds had spread through the provinces and had provoked acts of the most crying injustice mingled with atrocious pleasantries. The walls of places where the Christians assembled were covered with caricatures, and with calumnious or obscene inscriptions, aimed at the Christian brothers and sisters; and the fashion was quite in vogue of representing Jesus under the form of a man with an ass's head.' (Pp. 35–40.)

But far worse things than these were to come, when Nero had conceived the truly diabolical scheme of making the innocent Christians pay, with their lives and with unheard-of mental and bodily torments, for his guilt in causing—or at least in thoroughly enjoying—the disastrous conflagration of A.D. 64, which destroyed two-thirds of Rome.

'Nero had no need of extraneous aid, in order to conceive a design of such monstrosity as to derange all the ordinary calculations of historical induction. . . . And, though persuaded that the conflagration was the crime of Nero, many serious Romans saw in this *coup* a means of delivering the city from an intolerable pest. Tacitus, notwithstanding some qualms of pity, was of this opinion; and as to Suetonius, he reckons among the meritorious acts of Nero the punishment which he had inflicted on the partisans of a new and mischievous superstition. Yet these punishments were something absolutely frightful. Never before had such refinements of cruelty been witnessed. Almost all the Christians who were arrested were of a humble class; and the usual punishment of such unfortunates, when treason or sacrilege was laid to their charge, was to be thrown to wild beasts, or to be burned alive in the amphitheatre, with an addition of cruel scourgings. One of the most hideous characteristics of Roman manners was that they converted punishments into a fête and public executions into a public entertainment. Persia, in moments of fanaticism and terror, had used frightful forms of torture; and on more than one occasion had tasted a sombre kind of pleasure in inflicting them. But never before the establishment of Roman dominion had these horrors been made a public diversion, a subject for peals of laughter and applause. The amphitheatres had become the regular places of execution, and the tribunals of justice furnished materials for the sport. The roads that converged on Rome were crowded with the criminals of the whole world, to provide victims for the circus and amusement for the populace. . . . But, this time, to the barbarity of the executioner was added a touch of derision. The victims were reserved for a fête, to which (no doubt) an expiatory character was attached. Roman annals had known few days so extraordinary. The *ludus matutinus*, usually devoted to combats of animals, saw to-day an unheard-of procession. The condemned persons, sewn

up in skins of wild beasts, were thrust out into the arena to be torn by dogs; others were crucified; others again were clothed in tunics dipped in oil, pitch, or rosin, and then found themselves attached to stakes and reserved to illuminate the nocturnal festivities. When dusk came on, these living torches were set on fire. Nero offered for the spectacle his magnificent gardens beyond the Tiber, on the site of the modern Borgo and of the precincts and Church of St. Peter.' (Pp. 163-165.)

But physical suffering was not enough to satisfy the infernal malice of the heathen world against these pure and patient servants of the Crucified One. Moral tortures, mental anguish, brutal and Satanic invasions of all that a Christian holds most sacred and most inviolable, must be undergone by them, ere the baptism of blood was complete, ere the infant Church could be (like her Master) 'made perfect through sufferings.' The pen almost refuses to write, the brain almost refuses to conceive, the atrocities which followed. The heart and conscience of the reader can do no more, even now at the distance of 1800 years, than cry to heaven, with the souls of the slain under the Apocalyptic altar, 'How long, O Lord holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge this blood on them that dwell 'on the earth?'

'Even women, even virgins, were mixed up with these horrible sports; and nameless indignities were inflicted on them, as part of the festivities. It had become an established usage under Nero to force condemned persons to play in the amphitheatre mythological scenes which involved at last the death of the actor. These hideous operas, to which the application of ingenious mechanism lent an astonishing effect, were the novelties of the day. Greece would indeed have recoiled with surprise, had such attempts been suggested to her, to supplement æsthetics by ferocity, to make torture minister to art! The unhappy wretch was introduced into the arena richly dressed as a god or a hero destined to death. He then represented by his sufferings some tragic scene of pagan myth, consecrated by the works of poets and sculptors. Sometimes it was Hercules, frantic and burning on Mount Cæta and madly tearing from his flesh the tunic of blazing pitch. Sometimes it was Orpheus torn in pieces by a bear, Dædalus thrown from heaven and devoured by beasts, Pasiphaë undergoing the attacks of the bull, or Attys put to death. . . . Nero, no doubt, was present at these spectacles. As he was nearsighted, he used to wear a concave emerald in his eye to serve as an eyeglass for watching the combats of gladiators. He loved to make a parade of his knowledge as a connoisseur in sculpture; and it is even said that he vented his odious remarks over the dead body of his own mother, blaming this feature and praising that. Worthy of a connoisseur like him must have been the plastic forms and the colours presented by a human frame palpitat-

ing under the teeth of beasts, by a poor timid maiden with chaste gestures veiling her nudity and then tossed by a bull and torn in pieces on the pebbles of the arena! Yes, he was there, in the front rank, on the *podium*, supported by Vestals and Curule magistrates—with his bad face, his lowering looks, his blue eyes, his chestnut hair dressed in rows of curls, his terrible lip, his air (wicked and stupid at the same time) as of a great silly doll, supremely self-satisfied, puffed up with vanity. Meanwhile a brass band vibrated through the air, which was moistened with a spray of spurting blood.' (Pp. 167-173.)

Yet even this, it seems, was not all. The atrocities of Nero were to reach a still higher pitch of frenzy. And this master of the world was himself to condescend to these men and women of low estate, these innocent Christian lads and blushing girls, in order to torment and violate and render, as nearly as possible, their last moments a hell upon earth.

'Antichrist—yes, it was this monster in human form, this compound of ferocity, hypocrisy, immodesty and pride, who had travelled the world as a sort of mock-hero, had lighted up his coachman's triumphs with flambeaux of human flesh, had drunk deep of the blood of the saints, perhaps had done even worse still. For one is much disposed to believe that it is to the Christians that a passage of Suetonius refers, where he describes a frightful entertainment which Nero had invented. Lads, men, women, and young girls were attached naked to stakes in the arena. Then from the *cavea* a beast emerged, who attacked and outraged these helpless forms. . . . It was Nero himself clothed in the skin of a wild animal. . . . The fitting name then for Nero is found. It shall be THE BEAST. Caligula was called the *Anti-god*: Nero shall be the *Anti-Christ*. The idea of the Apocalypse is conceived.' (P. 178.)

We would not willingly have pained our readers by presenting to them, from M. Renan's graphic pages, these horrible scenes, were not the knowledge of them absolutely indispensable for the comprehension (1) of Nero's character, (2) of the Apocalypse of St. John. And as these two points not only form by far the most interesting subjects for study during the de-cennium (A.D. 60-70) with which we are at present engaged, but are also the two matters which are most fully and ably set forth in the volume before us, we shall devote to them the few remaining pages at our disposal.

(1) Nero's character would be very much misunderstood if it were supposed that he were nothing else than a mere monster of ferocity and cruelty. Such phenomena have indeed been seen. They have been, in a hundred cases, the result of elevation to the solitary and suspicious pinnacle of despotic power. But Nero was something more, or something less, than a suspicious



despot. His soul was vulgar to its very inmost fibre.\* His highest ambition was, not to govern well a world that lay at his feet, but to shine as a *primo tenore*, to receive the 'encores' of the gallery, to 'star it in the provinces,' to carry off from needy artists the prizes that properly belonged to them. His one absorbing care was, by a judicious use of lozenges and mufflers, to preserve the quality of his voice. He took lessons from professors of music. He haunted studios. He got up the art-cant of the day. He aimed, not to be a dilettante, not even to be a connoisseur, but to be a serious *artiste*; and he was fully persuaded that, should his present position as Roman Emperor ever become untenable, he could easily provide for himself, not merely a modest competence, but even a world-wide reputation, as a singer and musician on the stage. By what irony of fate the destinies of the world were placed in the hands of such a man, at one of the gravest crises of history, is one of the insoluble problems of human experience. The results, however, of this man's elevation to the throne of the Cæsars were of the most serious importance. First of all, in him the line of the Cæsars came to an end. The remedy for the state's disorders had now become worse than the disease. And the terrible hazards of a military election seemed preferable to the ignominy and ruin combined, which were the certain consequence of a dynasty of Neros. But amid the wars, commotions, mutinies, rebellions, and massacres in which the lurid reign of Nero sank and the great providential half-century of peace came to an end, it seemed to many people—and to the Seer of Patmos among the rest—that the Roman Empire itself was drawing to an end. And so it came to pass that the Jews, among other subject nations, were encouraged to think of a successful struggle for emancipation—nay, of a possible transfer of empire to themselves; and that desperate throw was hazarded, which issued in the utter destruction of the Jewish Temple and polity, in the final rejection of the husk from the kernel of Christianity, and in the freedom of the Church to combine once more the Pauline with the Petrine ingredients of her catholicity, and, in the power of that combination, to establish the Messiah's kingdom throughout the world.

'In five months the insurrection had succeeded in establishing itself

---

\* In thus characterising Nero, we regret to differ from M. Renan, who says more than once that he was a monster, but not a 'vulgar' one. We appeal, however, from the accomplished author's *epithets* to his own graphic and detailed descriptions. The word 'vulgar,' however, has not exactly the same sense in French as in English. It means here he was no 'common monster.'

in a formidable manner. Not only had it already mastered Jerusalem, but reaching across the desert of Judah it found itself in communication with the region of the Dead Sea, where it held all the fortresses. From thence it stretched out the hand to the Arabians and Nabathæans, who were more or less enemies to Rome, while Judæa, Idumæa, Peræa, Galilee were all friendly to the revolt. And at Rome, meantime, an odious despot was committing all the administration of the Empire to the most ignoble and the most incapable persons. Had the Jews succeeded in grouping around them the malcontents of the East, there had been an end of the Roman dominion in those parts. But unfortunately for them, the results were exactly the reverse. Their revolt inspired the whole population of Syria with redoubled fidelity to the Empire. For the hatred which they had enkindled in all around them sufficed, during the temporary paralysis of the Roman power, to excite against them enemies no less formidable than the legions. In a word, the whole East at this time seems to have obeyed the thrill of a universal impulse to massacre the Jews. The incompatibility of Jewish and of Græco-Roman ideas became more accentuated every day. One of the two races must needs exterminate the other.' (P. 247.)

Meanwhile the 'odious despot' had long been engaged in practising diligently with his cithern and his palette, and had, no doubt, attained a certain amount of success.

'Tigellinus was master of everything; and the Saturnalia was complete. Nero let it be understood more clearly every day that art alone was the serious business of life, that virtue was a mere pretence, that the "gallant man" was the man who was most frankly and avowedly shameless, that the "great man" was he who could best abuse everything, ruin everything, dissipate everything. A virtuous man was for him a hypocrite, a malignant, a dangerous person, and, above all, a rival. Whenever he discovered some horrible baseness which gave a certain colour to his theories, he experienced a transport of joy. . . . Never before had been seen such an *extravaganza*. The despots of the East, terrible and grave, broke into no such mad laughter, indulged no such excesses of æsthetic perversity. The insanity of Caligula had been of short duration: it had been a passing fit. And besides he had been mainly a buffoon, and had displayed some real wit. But the madness of Nero, usually pointless, was sometimes terribly tragical. The most horrible thing of all was to see him, by way of declamation, play with his own remorse and make of it a subject for his verses. With a melodramatic air, peculiar to himself, he would complain that he was tormented by the Furies; and would cite Greek verses about parricides. . . . The cause of all these aberrations was the depraved taste of the period, and the unmeasured importance which was given to a mere declamatory art, with aspirations after the enormous, with dreams of nothing but monstrosity. The ruling fashion in all things was a want of sincerity, a tinsel unreality (like that of the tragedies of Seneca), a skill in depicting simulated feelings, an art of speaking like an honest man without being one. The gigantesque did duty for the grand. Taste was altogether gone astray. It was the time of colossal statuary, of that art—materialistic, theatrical, and falsely pathetic—of which the *chef-d'œuvre*

is the Laocoon. . . . An ignoble taste for "tableaux vivants" was widely spread. People were no longer contented to follow in imagination the exquisite creations of the poets. They demanded to see the myths represented in actual flesh and blood. They went into ecstasies at the groupings, the postures, of the actors. Statuesque effects were admired. And the applause of 50,000 persons, gathered in one immense oval and mutually inflaming each other, was a thing so intoxicating that the sovereign himself came to envy the triumphs of a coachman, a singer, or an actor; and theatrical glory passed for the truest glory of all. . . . The people went from fête to fête, talked of nothing but the shows of yesterday, hoped for nothing but the shows of to-morrow; and ended by becoming much attached to a prince who thus made their life one perpetual raree-show. That Nero obtained an ignoble popularity by this means is beyond question. It went so far, that after his death Otho was able to succeed him by appealing to his memory, by imitating him, by reminding people that he himself had been one of the favourites at court. Indeed one cannot absolutely say that the wretch was without a heart, nor deficient in a certain sentiment of the good and the beautiful. So far from being incapable of friendship, he often showed himself a good comrade; and it was precisely that which rendered him cruel. He was determined to be loved and admired for his own sake; and was irritated against those who did not manifest towards him these feelings.' (Pp. 126-132.)

But, strange to say, it was not his cruelties, it was his bad taste, which ruined him. It was not his crimes, but his blunders, which brought on the frightful catastrophes of the latter part of his reign. Why did he burn Rome—or at least so greatly rejoice at its burning that it became necessary to sacrifice a holocaust of Christians by way of expiation to outraged public opinion? M. Renan shall answer that question for us.

'Although his talents were but mediocre, he still possessed some traits of a good artist. He painted well and sculptured well. His verses were good, in spite of a certain school-boy emphasis; and, say what one will, he made them himself. Suetonius saw his foul copies covered with erasures. He was the first to be touched with the charming landscape of Subiaco; and he made himself there a delicious summer-residence. . . . One might see him, whole nights long, seated beside the musician of the day [Terpnos], studying his play, lost in enjoyment, hanging on the sounds, panting, beside himself, breathing eagerly the air of another world which seemed to open before him by contact with a great artist. This was the origin of his disgust for the Romans, who were poor *connoisseurs*, and of his preference for the Greeks whom he thought alone capable of appreciating him, and for the Orientals who always "brought the house down" with their plaudits at his appearance. . . . But Rome, above all things, preoccupied his thoughts. His project was to rebuild it from top to bottom and to name it afresh—Neropolis. For a century past, it had been one of the wonders of the world. In size it rivalled the ancient capitals of Asia,

and its edifices were fine, strong, and solid. But its streets appeared mean to the taste of the day: for that taste tended more and more to vulgar and decorative construction, it aspired to broad effects such as rejoice the heart of gaping sightseers, and it condescended to a thousand tricks unknown to the ancient Greeks. At the head of the whole movement was Nero. The new Rome which he imagined was something like the Paris of our own day—one of those artificial cities, built to order, in planning which the great point aimed at is to catch the admiration of visitors from the country and of foreigners. The crack-brained youth was enraptured with these disordered fancies. He longed too for something unheard-of, some grandiose spectacle worthy of an artist, some occurrence which should mark in the almanac a date for his reign. "Up to my time," said he, "no one had yet found out "what wide licence is permitted to a Prince." (Pp. 136-143.)

'Elatus inflatusque tantis velut successibus, negavit quendam Principum scisse quid sibi liceret.\* Such are the words of Suetonius; and they appear to sum up, with admirable conciseness, the character of the man and the causes of the catastrophe which he brought upon the Roman world. Cæsarism had tried in Nero the utmost limits of human patience,—and had found them. And so, at last, the world shook off the spell that held it; and Nero must die. What was the manner of his death?

'The discords that prevailed among the armies of Gaul, the death of Vindex, and the weakness of Galba, might have even yet delayed the deliverance of the world, had not the army of Rome in its turn pronounced for revolt. The Prætorian troops rose on the evening of June 9 [A.D. 68], and proclaimed Galba Emperor. Nero saw that all was lost. But his perverted intellect still suggested to him nothing but grotesque ideas. He would put on mourning, and would harangue the populace in that guise. He would employ all his scenic arts to excite compassion and so to obtain an entire condonation of the past—perhaps, if it came to the very worst, a relegation to the Prefecture of Egypt. He wrote out his speech. But as some one remarked that he would be torn in pieces long before he reached the Forum, he lay down again. Then, awaking at midnight, he found his guards gone and his chamber already given over to pillage. He went out, knocked at different doors, no one answered. He returned, wished to die, called for Spiculus (a certain hand with the poignard, one of the celebrities of the amphitheatre); but everyone keeps off. He goes out again, wanders down the streets alone, contemplates throwing himself into the Tiber, comes back again. The world seems to stand off from him on all sides. At last, Phaon his freedman offers him his villa, about four miles away, as an asylum. . . . His ridiculous wit, his schoolboy vein, did not even then forsake him. It was suggested to conceal him in a hole of the soft rock, such as frequently occur in those parts. He im-

---

\* Suetonius, 'Nero,' § 37.

mediately seized the occasion for a word or two of stage-effect: "What destiny! to go down alive beneath the earth!" His reflections were like a continuous discharge of classical quotations, mixed with heavy pleasantries. For every circumstance he had some apt literary reminiscence, some unmeaning antithesis. "He who formerly was so proud of his numerous attendants has now but three freedmen at his bidding." At intervals the remembrance of his victims came back to him; but only to engender figures of rhetoric, never a moral act of repentance. The comedian outlived everything else. . . . Meanwhile an emissary of Phaon arrives from Rome, bringing a despatch. Nero seizes it from his hand, and reads that the Senate has declared him a public enemy and has condemned him to the customary death. What is this "customary death"? he cries. And learning that the victim, stripped naked, had his head secured in a forked stake, after which he was scourged to death and then dragged by a hook and thrown into the Tiber,—with a groan, he draws out two poignards that he had about him, tries the points, and sheathes them with a remark that "the fatal hour is not yet come." . . . Presently, he redoubled his citations, spoke in Greek, made scraps of verses. Suddenly the noise of cavalry is heard, coming to take him alive. "The thundering step of horses greets my ears," said he (quoting the *Iliad*.) Epaphroditus then leaned upon the poignard and forced it into his throat. The centurion, arriving at the same moment, tried to staunch the blood, and made believe to try and save him. "Too late!" said the dying man, whose eyes were starting from his head and were glazed with horror: "such is fidelity!" This was in his very best comic vein. Nero letting fall a melancholy plaint over the wickedness of his age, over the disappearance of good faith and virtue from the world!—Excellent! done: the drama is played out.' (P. 309.)

We feel sure that our readers will thank us for presenting them, in considerable completeness, with this masterly portraiture, by the hand of a consummate artist, of a most singular and important historical personage. It is true that the materials from which M. Renan has composed this graphic sketch were fully accessible, and were perfectly well known to scholars. But we do not remember to have ever seen those materials so effectively used before; and we believe that so correct and at the same time so spirited a description of Nero, both as a man and also as an agent in the great unfolding drama of human history, has not hitherto been given to the world.

(2) Meanwhile, to the writer of the *Apocalypse* this man was not merely a curiosity, but a living horror. And it only remains that we offer a few concluding remarks on that extraordinary book in which Nero plays so dark and sinister a part. For that book, having been thought by the Church worthy of a place upon her list (or 'canon') of Holy Scriptures, has become part of the common stock of Christian literature; and for

one person who takes an interest in the biography of Nero there are probably ten thousand who take a profound and personal interest in this singular product of an Apostolic pen. How widely important and popular a field of inquiry, then, is at once opened to us, when we become fully awakened to the fact that here we have a book, the date of which is positively ascertained and the writer almost certainly known; while its contents are of a prophetic character and lay a marked claim to 'inspiration,' yet are so purely historical in their character, and deal with a period of history so perfectly well known down to its minutest details, that it can be checked and verified at every turn. Might we not almost say that we have here, as likewise in the Book of Daniel, a gauge by which to measure 'inspiration,' a sample by which to understand 'prophecy,' a key—providentially furnished for those who will faithfully use it—for a full and intelligent comprehension of what 'Holy Scripture' is and what it really means? So that, while the lessons to be drawn from Nero's life—lessons on the perils of Cæsarism, on the folly of governing by the 'residuum' of the least educated classes, on the fatuity of trusting to *panem et Circenses*—are patent to everyone, and indeed may be read at a glance between the lines of M. Renan's book on every page, it were a worthier task by far to enable the ordinary Christian to read between the lines of the Apocalypse some of God's teachings about His own ways with His Church and about the true meaning of His own Word.

That those ways should be different from our ways, and that 'Word' something in point of fact totally unlike what the heart of pious ignorance has been able to conceive, is no more than might reasonably be expected. And accordingly, on studying the Apocalypse, we discover two or three remarkable and (humanly speaking) very unlikely phenomena.

First of all, we discover that God's Word—meaning thereby His special method of teaching man religion through the lips of other highly-gifted races or men—has been, like everything else in the world, subject to certain laws of growth, culmination, and decline. If we are surprised at this, are not the growth, luxuriance, and decay of a literature, the ripening and then the gradual break-up of a language, the infancy, maturity, and senility of an individual mind, analogous and equally surprising phenomena? There is then a natural close, as there is a natural beginning, to the canon of Scripture. And just as the Book of Daniel is the closing cadence of Old Testament prophecy, so is the Apocalypse of St. John the true peroration of the New Testament. Previously, no doubt, to any written

system of religious training there is always the personal agency of strong and high-souled men. And subsequently to the written system there arise other agencies, which have all a history and sequence of their own. But with neither of these are we at present concerned. It is the *Scriptural* phase of man's religious education of which we are speaking. And within that zone we observe four or five successive stages: (1) religious lyrical poetry; (2) written legislation, ritual and disciplinary; (3) didactic history; (4) written 'prophecy;' (5) among Semitic races, Apocalypse.

'Apocalypse,' then, may be called the decay, the senility, of prophecy, just as a love for the gigantesque and the sensational marks the decay of true taste. It made its first appearance among the Jews under Assyrian influences, during the Captivity. There is no trace of it in Isaiah, B.C. 700; there is already some trace of it in Ezekiel, about B.C. 600. But it is in Daniel, about B.C. 170, during the fierce excitements of Greek persecution and of Maccabæan revolt, that this style attained its full proportions and became henceforth the favourite mode of religious instruction. Henceforward, in quick succession, we have a whole series of Apocalyptic writings: (1) the Sibylline Verses (book iii.), about B.C. 150; (2) the Book of Enoch, about B.C. 110; (3) the Fourth Book of Esdras, about B.C. 30; (4) the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs; (5) the Ascension of Isaiah; (6) the Assumption of Moses; (7) the Apocalypse of Baruch; (8) the Apocalypse of Abraham; (9) the Prophecies of Hystaspes; (10) the Apocalypse of Adam; (11) of Judah; (12) of Moses; (13) of Isaiah; (14) of Zephaniah; (15) of Zechariah; (16) of Peter; (17) of Paul; (18) of Cerinthus; (19) of Thomas; (20) of Stephen; (21) the Shepherd of Hermas; (22) the Verses of Commodian. Of a great number of these works the dates are quite conjectural, and no copies appear to be now extant. But of their existence, and of the general nature of their contents, there can be no doubt whatever. The history of the 'Apocalypse of Paul' happens to be known, and is instructive; while it points to a modern instance of the same kind of forgery which has vexed the Church in our own day. 'They relate,' says Sozomen (a writer of the fifth century), 'that by divine revelation there was discovered, beneath St. Paul's house at Tarsus, a marble chest, inside which this book was found.' The 'Book of Mormon,' we all know, was discovered in the same way. And as its contents are of a similar character, we may perhaps reckon this as the twenty-third—and possibly as the last—Apocalypse.

The second point worthy of remark, in studying the Revelation of St. John, is the entire failure of this prophecy, as of all other Apocalyptic works, if it be regarded as a merely mechanical or oracular forecast of future events. It seems clear, on a really faithful study of Holy Scripture, that such mere soothsaying was never, in any marked degree, the intention of prophecy at all. But when Apocalypse began to busy itself with mere world-empires, and with the political succession of events, it cannot be a matter of surprise if its predictions went astray, and if—although full of sound moral and religious teaching for the period whose taste it suited—for people of a far different age and race and education it has proved a hopeless puzzle, and a mine from which industry or enthusiasm may dig out whatever they had previously put there. It is perfectly certain, for instance, that Nero did not in fact return, that the Roman empire did not in fact break up till more than three centuries later, that not a part but the whole of Jerusalem and of the Jewish Temple was destroyed, that the Second Advent of our Lord to judgment did not soon—nay, has not yet—occurred. But, in spite of all this, we venture to say that the Apocalypse of St. John, that Hebrew prophecy, on the whole has nevertheless *not* failed; that, properly understood, its forecasts have been, for every rational and religious purpose, successful; and that this kind of success is amply sufficient to warrant us in holding fast to the still larger and more distant vaticinations of the Church and of Holy Scripture, and in ‘maintaining our integrity’ as believers in the Gospel.

For it is religious confidence in God which is the essential teaching of all these books. The oldest religious poetry that we have—by ‘the prophet David,’ Moses, and others—is all inspired with this one glorious theme: ‘the world may seem against us, wicked men may seem to triumph, God’s people may cry for a time, “My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?” But a reversal of all this disorder is sure one day to come. There is One who sits serene, above all this turmoil of waves and storms. And goodness, order, reason—we cannot prove it, but we know it, we feel it, we dogmatically assert it: let him that hath ears to hear, hear it!—shall ultimately prevail.’ Next comes written legislation. In the Mosaic Law, derived from Moses but reduced to shape at a later date, we have the same magnificent confidence in a higher order, ‘behind the veil,’ reduced into ritual and symbolical forms for daily handling. Then follows didactic history—the annals of the race, whose specialty was religion, reduced by the ‘earlier prophets’ into telling



narratives, with a view to teach the lesson, ever old and ever new, that to forget and despair of the higher ideals is a nation's ruin; and that a hundred recorded deliverances on the smaller scale should arouse a nation (or at least a 'remnant' of them) to energetic repentance and sanguine hopes of restoration. Then follow the 'later prophets'—distinct, rhetorical, outspoken preachers of the same grand truths; couching their message in forms suitable to their day, and varying both in style and matter according to the varying horizon of their times and the different personal gifts and characters of the speakers. Last of all comes 'Apocalypse.' And this, too—in colossal imagery and wild sensational language, suited to excited periods of terrible catastrophe, of captivity and persecution—aims still to say the same thing. The oppressor may *seem* to flourish. The Syrian empire, or the Roman, may *seem* to be carrying all before them. The bitter persecutor may *seem* to be having it all his own way. The righteous may cry, 'How long, O Lord, 'holy and true?' But there is looming, behind the veil, another and a higher order than all this. It only awaits God's own time to be revealed. For History too, as well as Nature, is subject to God's laws and is no matter of caprice or chance. Man too will find, at last, that the little eddy of his own misused freewill was being borne along the majestic slow-paced tide that issues in the sea. And they who have *believed*, who have gone out from an idolatrous world 'not knowing whither they 'went,' have trusted to the higher order and not the lower, have lived by the ideal not the real; these will find at last that they were not deceived, that Christ (not Antichrist) rules the universe, that Reason and not un-reason, Order and not chaos, God and not the devil, are supreme and must in the end be triumphant.

Now all this is precisely what that wonderful Semitic lesson-book of religion, the Bible, sums up in the single word FAITH. All ethical action is there concentrated in that one burning focus of human emotion, 'love.' All ethical speculation is there reduced to its ultimate and most practical terminology in the word 'faith.' In short, the Bible bids us shape our character and guide our conduct, amid the intricate mazes of life, rather by the conscience than by the intellect or the senses; it tells us that the natural law written on our hearts by the finger of God is as true and indelible as the physical laws written by sunbeams on the sky; it encourages us therefore to uplift our eyes confidently to that ideal of a perfect humanity which has been presented to us in Christ; it tells us that the ingrain sense of the stability of justice, of the godlike majesty of

goodness, are really a revelation of the truth, woven by our Maker's hand into the very texture of our being; and that a faith which risks all—nay, sacrifices all—for that, will not find itself disappointed at last. But it also warns us that in *details* we are very likely to be—not indeed disappointed, but—entirely mistaken. It narrates for us how thoroughly unlike, yet how infinitely surpassing, all their previous anticipations was the Messiah of the Jews. It bids us comprehend how, contradicting the letter of prophecy, a post-captivity 'dispersion' reached the Gentiles by a thousand unexpected avenues, and so more than fulfilled its spirit. It shows us how a series of Apocalyptic efforts to sketch out the future triumph of 'God's kingdom' over the world-empires, signally failing in time, in place, in circumstance, yet more signally came true in the barbaric overthrow of the Roman empire and the establishment of modern Christendom. And it thereby encourages the belief that—not in any expected way, but in some totally unexpected and unimagined way and time and place—its teachings and the teaching of our hearts' deepest instincts will, on the larger scale, come true; that we shall somehow survive our death; that we shall see once more those whom we have loved and lost; that Christ will, in some shape, return; that the victory of truth and righteousness and wisdom will, one day, be assured; and that the 'children of wisdom' will share it.

ART. IX.—*A Journal of the Reigns of King George IV. and King William IV.* By the late CHARLES C. F. GREVILLE, Esq., Clerk of the Council to those Sovereigns. Edited by HENRY REEVE, Registrar of the Privy Council. Three Volumes, 8vo. London: 1874.

THE three volumes, the title of which we have prefixed to this article, are a very curious and interesting work. They are the Journal of the late Mr. Charles Greville, kept by him during the reigns of George IV. and William IV., and containing notices, memoranda, and remarks from time to time on men, politics, and society during that important and eventful period. The author was a man whose social position gave him access to all circles, and whose friendship with many of the distinguished men of the time afforded him unusual opportunities of information. The Journal dates as far back as 1819, while the author lived until 1865, but the portion now published ends with the accession of her present Majesty in 1837. It

has one singular characteristic: that it faithfully reflects the author's impressions at the moment; and these remain recorded, however much subsequent events may have altered or qualified them. We have these impressions substantially in their original form; and relating as they do to all the most prominent men and most remarkable public and political events of the day, they are a valuable addition to the history of the times. Now and then the author interpolates a note expressive of the effect of subsequent reflection or occurrences on the tenor of his narrative, or his recorded opinions. But, on the whole, the book contains the contemporaneous impressions, thoughts, and sentiments of a very acute observer, regarding all that is most interesting to the student of history during the years embraced in these volumes.

The editor, in his Preface, gives the following account of the circumstances to which the present publication owes its origin:—

“The author of these Journals requested me, in January 1865, a few days before his death, to take charge of them with a view to publication at some future time. He left that time to my discretion, merely remarking that memoirs of this kind ought not, in his opinion, to be locked up until they had lost their principal interest by the death of all those who had taken any part in the events they describe. He placed several of the earlier volumes at once in my hands, and he intimated to his surviving brother and executor, Mr. Henry Greville, his desire that the remainder should be given me for this purpose. This injunction was at once complied with after Mr. Charles Greville's death, and this interesting deposit has now remained for nearly ten years in my possession. In my opinion this period of time is long enough to remove every reasonable objection to the publication of a contemporary record of events already separated from us by a much longer interval, for the transactions related in these volumes commence in 1818 and end in 1837. I therefore commit to the press that portion of these Memoirs which embraces the reigns of King George IV. and King William IV., ending with the accession of her present Majesty.

“In the discharge of this trust I have been guided by no other motive than the desire to present these Memorials to the world in a manner which their Author would not have disapproved, and in strict conformity to his own wishes and injunctions. He himself, it should be said, had frequently revised them with great care. He had studiously omitted and erased passages relating to private persons and affairs, which could only serve to gratify the love of idle gossip and scandal. The Journals contain absolutely nothing relating to his own family, and but little relating to his private life. In a passage (not now published) of his own writings, the Author remarks, “A Journal, to be good, true, “and interesting, should be written without the slightest reference to “publication but without any fear of it: it should be the transcript

"of a mind that can bear transcribing. I always contemplate the possibility that hereafter my Journal will be read, and I regard with alarm and dislike the notion of its containing matters about myself which nobody will care to know."

Upon these principles this Journal has evidently been written. It is perfectly fearless, independent, and, as far as the information of the writer extended, true. Mr. Greville's own position, partly from the nature of the permanent office he held in the Privy Council, and partly from his personal intimacies with men of very opposite opinions, was a neutral one; but he used that neutral position with consummate judgment and address to remove obstacles, to allay irritations, to compose differences, and to promote, as far as lay in his power, the public welfare. Contented with his own social position, he was alike free from ambition and from vanity. No man was more entirely disinterested in his judgments on public affairs, for he had long made up his mind that he had nothing to gain or to lose by them, and in the opinions he formed, and on occasion energetically maintained, he cared for nothing but their justice and their truth.' (Preface, p. viii.) •

No man was better qualified, by talents and by position, than the late Clerk of the Council to leave such a record of his times behind him. He had no political functions; he had no official knowledge of any political secrets; and he occupied a very favourable position for the observation of those who were more actively engaged in public life. But perhaps his own independence and impartiality rendered him too severe a critic of the mistakes and shortcomings of those who had to bear heavier responsibilities.

A sharp, keen, critical man of society, moving in all circles and having access to all sources of information, but entirely removed by his office from political action, and for the most part a bystander, not a combatant, has no doubt many advantages when he records, in private, day by day, what he has heard, and what he thinks of passing events. He looks on while the game proceeds; he watches its progress, and having no interest personally in the gain or loss, he is fairly impartial in his estimate of the skill and qualities of the players. Perhaps, however, he has some disadvantages also. The heat and collision of action and contest is an element in judging of public men which the cool spectator cannot possess. Seeing close at his side the errors, the blunders, the weaknesses of the actors, even those whom the outside audience applaud to the echo, the latter is apt to lack the toleration which the actual difficulties and responsibility of the crisis demand, and which the performers willingly accord. With a keen desire for the right, as he holds it, it chafes him to see the end

sacrificed to the frailties from which none are free, and the contingencies against which the ablest cannot provide. So that such a man is often apt to think 'a plague of both your 'houses,' and expresses his irritation in the retirement of his study in sharp and bitter phrases. Many of these harsh expressions, however, are but the reflection of temporary and passing moods of thought, which, as the book proceeds, are sometimes recanted altogether, and almost always qualified or balanced by hearty praise. The strength and pungency of Mr. Greville's language is unreserved, and he dashes off a man's character by his least amiable trait, as if he presented a complete and accurate portrait, whereas his mind was only occupied at the time by the quality on which he dilates. Hardly one of his great contemporaries escapes this process in the course of these volumes; yet the result is, in most instances, neither unfriendly nor untrue, and leaves the real character of the man not lower but more distinct than before.

A man who writes history from well-informed gossip in social circles contributes an important, although an unstable, element to truth, and many of the most interesting portions of Mr. Greville's *Journal* throw a great deal of light on the causes of public events, although he himself truly says, in a very notable instance, that anecdotes are not historical facts (vol. i. p. 113). It is always a question of time when such materials can be legitimately used, for the freedom and confidence of social intercourse would be much restrained were the words which pass in the openness of friendship, however authentic and remarkable, to be treasured and forthwith given to the world. But the events which are here written of are nearly half a century old. The chief actors in them have passed away, and the topics which were current when this *Journal* was penned, have long melted into the domain of history.

One more remark we must make, on a feature which adds little or nothing to the information of the reader, and which recurs too frequently in these volumes. We allude to the broad and sometimes severe terms in which he speaks of the two sovereigns whose reigns he illustrates. Royalty, of course, must, like other actors in public events, fall under the pen of the historian and the estimate of the critic; but mere personalities, however true in themselves, war with the instincts of this country, when used with regard to their sovereigns. In an hereditary monarchy like ours we have not always had the advantage of living in a reign in which, as in the present, the personal character and early training of the sovereign has yielded so large an addition of stability and lustre to the throne.

That her immediate predecessors fell far short of this standard is true; but there is little advantage in reviving old Court gossip, notorious, though not forgotten, or in parading the weaknesses or follies which in those days were to be found behind the throne. Of the Court and character of George IV. there is nothing left for the public to learn, and little it can be profitable to remember. But his successor, although far from intellectually able, did his best to govern honestly in very difficult and trying circumstances. Mr. Greville himself says of him in 1830, soon after his accession, 'The fact is he 'is an incomparable king, and deserves all the encomiums 'lavished on him' (vol. ii. p. 63). We therefore regret to find expressions erring as much in the way of disparagement as the sentence we have just quoted is extravagant in that of praise. The part of the book relative to the Royal Family which we have read with the greatest pleasure is the notice of the Duke of York, from whom Mr. Greville received much attention in early life, and which are conceived in a pleasant and kindly spirit, and are interesting in themselves. But we pass on to matters which have more novelty, and are more likely to attract the attention of our readers.

The *Journal* has two aspects of interest: one as a commonplace book, and a portrait gallery of remarkable men; the other as a key to important political events at a momentous period of the history of this country. Even when he relates occurrences and transactions which have been previously described by others the author's point of view is so unusual, his observation so acute, and his pen so sharp and racy, that we have derived much pleasure and amusement from his treatment of familiar scenes.

It is impossible, either by criticism or extracts, to convey any sufficient impression of the merits of these volumes as a commonplace book. Their resources are inexhaustible; and although strung together without method, all incongruous topics jostling each other, there is hardly a page which does not contain materials both novel and interesting. The sketches given by Mr. Greville of the distinguished men of his time have the advantage of being drawn from life. With most of them he lived on terms of intimacy, and with all of them on terms of equality. He is not dazzled by greatness, and speaks his mind with a freedom which sometimes runs into censoriousness. Even with those he most admired and liked, of whom there are not many, he does not scruple to press heavily on their foibles; and if these have a harsh name, he gives it. As we have already said, his estimates are hasty, sometimes entirely

at fault. Yet the critic is kindly after all; acknowledges great qualities when he finds them; and finds them sometimes in quarters where it is plain he did not look for them. The result of all is not to lower great men in our eyes, but to make us know them better than we did.

Some of these hasty judgments are amusing enough: it is diverting to see in the course of his memoranda how time falsifies his opinions. He ventures on prophecy with considerable boldness; and he has courage enough to leave his prediction uncanceled, and even to give expression and point to his failure. He foretells perpetuity to Cabinets, when a few pages farther on record their downfall, and perpetual exclusion to statesmen who ruled this country for years afterwards. So in his appreciation of men. Lord Althorp's leadership of the House he treats with derision when he first assumed that office: and in this instance, although he admits on various occasions the ability he displayed, his final judgment is much the same as his first. But he was wrong. Lord Althorp was not a great orator or debater; but he had qualities which made him a great leader of the House of Commons, if leading consist in inducing others to follow. He ruled with absolute sway in the first Reformed Parliament, and in individual influence might fairly compare with the greatest of his successors: and when his leadership came to an end, the reign of his party ceased also.

Lord Russell also he entirely misjudged, which is the more remarkable that he had, and expresses, the strongest personal regard for him. When he first assumed the leadership of his party in 1835, Mr. Greville writes under date April 3rd:—

‘If John Russell does come in, it is clear that he will have both Peel and Stanley in opposition to him, against whom in the nearly balanced state of parties he could not struggle on for a month. He was miserably feeble in this debate (in his opening speech), and though he may just do to lead an Opposition which wants no leading, and merely sticks him up as a nominal chief, he could no more lead a Government in the House of Commons than he could command an army in the field.’ (Vol. iii. p. 240.)

But he adds within brackets, under the date 1837, ‘So much for my prediction. Stanley’s followers dropped off and left him alone, the Government had no difficulty, and John Russell proved a very good leader.’ And so to be sure, in less than a year, the Journal sounds a very different note. In February 1836 Mr. Greville thus writes:—

‘February 25th.—Lord John Russell immortalised himself on Tuesday night. After a speech from Hume of three hours, in which he pro-

duced a variety of the most inconceivable letters from Kenyon, Wynford, Londonderry, and other Orangemen, but made the most miserable hash of his whole case, and instead of working up his ample materials with dexterity and effect stupidly blundering and wasting them all—after this speech John Russell rose, and in a speech far surpassing his usual form, dignified, temperate, and judicious, moved a resolution of a moderate and inoffensive character. The speech actually drew tears from the Orangemen, enthusiastic approbation from Stanley, a colder approval from Peel, and the universal assent of the House. . . . In accomplishing this by moderate and healing counsels, by a conciliatory tone and manner, Lord John Russell deserves the name of a statesman. His speech is worth a thousand flowery harangues which have elicited the shouts of audiences or the admiration of readers, and he has probably conferred a great and permanent benefit upon the country.' (Vol. iii. p. 344.)

Mr. Greville lived to see Lord Russell become a most successful leader and a formidable debater; holding his own with effect and spirit against all comers, and quite able to cope with Peel even in his most powerful days. It is remarkable, as the editor points out, that of a man who was twice Prime Minister, and who led his party in the House of Commons for more than fifteen years, Mr. Greville should tell us that on the formation of the Grey Government in 1831, 'John Russell was to have the War Office, but Tavistock entreated that the appointment might be changed, as his brother's health was unequal to it; so he was made Paymaster' (vol. ii. p. 70).

The notices of Lord Palmerston very dimly foreshadow his future greatness. The author did not mean or expect him to be great; and yet, in the very few fragmentary references to him there lurks evidently an uneasy suspicion that he might be wrong. The first time it flashes on him that there were the germs of distinction in the careless man of fashion, is on the debate on the Catholic question in 1829. 'A speech from Lord Palmerston,' he says, 'which astonished everybody.' 'An imitation of Canning, and not a bad one' (vol. i. p. 191). In 1834 our author writes:—

'Madame de Lieven told me that it was impossible to describe the contempt as well as dislike which the whole corps diplomatique had for Palmerston, and pointing to Talleyrand, who was sitting close by, "surtout lui." They have the meanest opinion of his capacity, and his manners are the reverse of conciliatory. She cannot imagine how his colleagues bear with him, and Lord Grey supports him vehemently. The only friend he has in the cabinet is Graham, who has no weight. His unpopularity in his own office is quite as great as it is among the foreign ministers, and he does nothing, so that they do not make up in respect for what they want in inclination.' (Vol. iii. pp. 56, 57.)



Again, on the election in 1835 he writes :—‘ Palmerston is ‘beaten in Hants, at which everyone rejoices, for he is marvel-  
‘lously unpopular’ (vol. iii. p. 197). But alas for Madame de Lieven’s estimate—she had her own grievance about the Russian Embassy—and the gossip of the clubs, Mr. Greville tells us, ten pages on, of this inefficient and unpopular minister :—

‘ The other night I met some clerks in the Foreign Office to whom the very name of Palmerston is hateful, but I was surprised to hear them (Mellish particularly, who can judge both from capacity and opportunity) give ample testimony to his abilities. They said that he wrote admirably, and could express himself perfectly in French, very sufficiently in Italian, and understood German; that his diligence and attention were unwearied—he read everything and wrote an immense quantity; that the Foreign Ministers (who detest him) did him justice as an excellent man of business. His great fault is want of punctuality, and never caring for an engagement if it did not suit him, keeping everybody waiting for hours on his pleasure or caprice. This testimony is beyond suspicion, and it is confirmed by the opinions of his colleagues; but it is certain that he cut a very poor figure in Parliament all the time he was in office before.’ (Vol. iii. pp. 210, 211.)

And a year afterwards he inserts this palinode, which shows how misleading had been the elements on which his original judgment had been formed :—

‘ It is surprising to hear how Palmerston is spoken of by those who know him well officially—the Granvilles, for example. Lady Granville, a woman expert in judging, thinks his capacity first-rate; that it approaches to greatness from his enlarged views, disdain of trivialities, resolution, decision, confidence, and above all his contempt of clamour and abuse. She told me that Madame de Flahaut had a letter written by Talleyrand soon after his first arrival in England, in which he talked with great contempt of the Ministers generally, Lord Grey included, and said there was but one statesman among them, and that was Palmerston. His ordinary conversation exhibits no such superiority; but when he takes his pen in his hand his intellect seems to have full play, and probably when engaged exclusively in business.’ (Vol. iii. p. 366.)

Talleyrand’s good opinion had been previously noticed. The old statesman had recognised the ring of true metal, although the clubs were deaf to it. It is certainly not impossible that Lord Palmerston may have given no measure of his real capacity during the twenty years that he filled a subordinate office in a Tory Government, and may, when he assumed the direction of Foreign affairs, have exerted himself to make up for past deficiencies; for no man was more sensible of failure, and he never allowed false pride to impede his endeavours to

repair an error. This, indeed, was one secret of his ultimate and unquestioned supremacy.

Of the gay, witty, *insouciant*, and able Melbourne our author had a more just and discriminating estimate. He was an unlucky Minister, for he hardly ever had a majority; but his services to the Crown and the country at the commencement of the present reign have laid the nation under obligations they have not forgotten. 'He is certainly a queer fellow,' writes Mr. Greville in July 1834, 'to be Prime Minister, and he and Brougham are two wild chaps to have the destinies of their country in their hands. I should not be surprised if Melbourne was to rouse his dormant energies, and be excited by the greatness of his position to display the vigour and decision in which he is not deficient.'

There is no detailed character of Melbourne, but many characteristic notices scattered up and down the book illustrative of the man, with whom the author was on terms of intimacy. He mentions earlier in his *Journal* a conversation he had with him about Palmerston, when Lord Melbourne assured him that there was no foundation for the assertion that he was unpleasant and haughty to his colleagues; in fact that he was quite the reverse. More interesting, however, to the general reader than his political career are some instances given by Mr. Greville of his wonderful literary knowledge. There are a couple of pages devoted to the description of two dinner parties at Holland House, which are well worthy of being preserved, if it were only to teach a younger and more superficial generation how the last generation were wont to converse. Greville himself says of one of these parties:—

'September 5th.—At Holland House yesterday, where I had not been these two years. Met Lord Holland at Court, who made me go. . . . Spring Rice and his son, Melbourne, and Palmerston dined there: Allen was at Dulwich, but came in the evening, and so did Bobus Smith. There was a great deal of very good talk, anecdotes, literary criticism, and what not, some of which would be worth remembering, though hardly sufficiently striking to be put down, unless as forming a portion of a whole course of conversations of this description. A vast depression came over my spirits, though I was amused, and I don't suppose I uttered a dozen words. It is certainly true that the atmosphere of Holland House is often oppressive, but that was not it; it was a painful consciousness of my own deficiencies and of my incapacity to take a fair share in conversation of this description. I felt as if a language was spoken before me which I understood, but not enough to talk in it myself. There was nothing discussed of which I was altogether ignorant, and when the merits of Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Crabbe were brought into comparison, and Lord Holland

cut jokes upon Allen for his enthusiastic admiration of the "De Moribus Germanorum," it was not that I had not read the poets or the historian, but that I felt I had not read them with profit.' (Vol. iii. pp. 126, 127.)

And so they discussed poets; 'Philip van Artevelde,' Madame de Staël, Sappho, Quintus Curtius, and Klopstock. Two days after this he again dines there:—

'September 7th.—At Holland House again; only Bobus Smith and Melbourne; these two, with Allen, and Lord Holland agreeable enough. Melbourne's excellent scholarship and universal information remarkably display themselves in society, and he delivers himself with an energy which shows how deeply his mind is impressed with literary subjects.

'After dinner there was much talk of the Church, and Allen spoke of the early reformers, the Catharists, and how the early Christians persecuted each other; Melbourne quoted Vigilantius's letter to Jerome, and then asked Allen about the 11th of Henry IV., an Act passed by the Commons against the Church, and referred to the dialogue between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely at the beginning of Shakespeare's "Henry V.," which Lord Holland sent for and read, Melbourne knowing it all by heart and prompting all the time. Lingard says of this statute that the Commons proposed to the King to commit an act of spoliation on the clergy, but that the King sharply rebuked them and desired to hear no more of the matter. About etymologies Melbourne quoted Tooke's "Diversions of Purley," which he seemed to have at his fingers' ends.' (Vol. iii. pp. 130, 131.)

In another passage he says that John Allen told him that Melbourne being a very good Greek scholar had compared the 'Evidences' and all modern theological works with the writings of the Fathers. The man who could acquire so much solid knowledge, living as he did the life of an easy man of pleasure and society, must have had powers and capacity which should have made him more than Prime Minister of England.

Of Sir James Graham when he first took office the author formed an absurdly low estimate, as he himself afterwards confesses. The passage is so curious that we quote it entire:—

'Graham's elevation is the most monstrous of all. He was once my friend, a college intimacy revived in the world, and which lasted six months, when, thinking he could do better, he cut me, as he had done others before. I am not a fair judge of him, because the pique which his conduct to me naturally gave me would induce me to underrate him, but I take vanity and self-sufficiency to be the prominent features of his character, though of the extent of his capacity I will give no opinion. Let time show; I think he will fail. [Time did show it to be very considerable, and the *volvenda dies* brought back our former friendship, as will hereafter appear; he certainly did *not* fail.]

‘He came into Parliament ten years ago, spoke and failed. He had been a provincial hero, the Cicero and the Romeo of Yorkshire and Cumberland, a present Lovelace and a future Pitt. He was disappointed in love (the particulars are of no consequence), married and retired to digest his mortifications of various kinds, to become a country gentleman, patriot, reformer, financier, and what, not, always good-looking (he had been very handsome), pleasing, intelligent, cultivated, agreeable as a man can be who is not witty and who is rather pompous and slow, after many years of retirement, in the course of which he gave to the world his lucubrations on corn and currency. Time and the hour made him master of a large but encumbered estate and member for his county. Armed with the importance of representing a great constituency, he started again in the House of Commons; took up Joseph Hume’s line, but ornamented it with graces and flourishes which had not usually decorated such dry topics. He succeeded, and in that line is now the best speaker in the House. I have no doubt he has studied his subjects and practised himself in public speaking. Years and years ago I remember his delight on Hume’s comparison between Demosthenes and Cicero, and how he knew the passage by heart; but it is one thing to attack strong abuses and fire off well rounded set phrases, another to administer the naval affairs of the country and be ready to tilt against all comers, as he must do for the future.’ (Vol. ii. pp. 90, 91.)

Their early friendship was afterwards renewed and ripened into mutual confidence, and Sir James Graham exerted himself more than once with great vigour and effect in matters touching Mr. Greville’s interests. The description of the part he bore when Lord Stanley left the Liberal ranks is more respectful to his ability, but by no means so to his political character. But Mr. Greville might be pardoned for not foreseeing the very distinguished position which Sir James Graham afterwards gained. He acquired it slowly; and even after he had become one of the most formidable debaters in the House he owned, and it was true, although no one who heard him would have thought so, that he never addressed it with entire self-possession. He was bold and clear in thought, but nervous in action, and more a leader of men in private than he was in public. As an administrator of a department he had few equals.

One of the men whom Mr. Greville disparages in his earlier notices, and to whom at last he yields his tribute of unfeigned admiration, is Macaulay; and it is interesting to observe, as the Journal proceeds, how his impressions change. His first meeting with him is amusingly described:—

‘February 6th.—Dined yesterday with Lord Holland; came very late, and found a vacant place between Sir George Robinson and a common-looking man in black. As soon as I had time to look at my neighbour,

I began to speculate (as one usually does) as to who he might be, and as he did not for some time open his lips except to eat, I settled that he was some obscure man of letters or of medicine, perhaps a cholera doctor. In a short time the conversation turned upon early and late education, and Lord Holland said he had always remarked that self-educated men were peculiarly conceited and arrogant, and apt to look down upon the generality of mankind, from their being ignorant of how much other people knew; not having been at public schools, they are uninformed of the course of general education. My neighbour observed that he thought the most remarkable example of self-education was that of Alfieri, who had reached the age of thirty without having acquired any accomplishment save that of driving, and who was so ignorant of his own language that he had to learn it like a child, beginning with elementary books. Lord Holland quoted Julius Cæsar and Scaliger as examples of late education, said that the latter had been wounded, and that he had been married and commenced learning Greek the same day, when my neighbour remarked "that he supposed "his learning Greek was not an instantaneous act like his marriage." This remark, and the manner of it, gave me the notion that he was a dull fellow, for it came out in a way which bordered on the ridiculous, so as to excite something like a sneer. I was a little surprised to hear him continue the thread of conversation (from Scaliger's wound) and talk of Loyola having been wounded at Pampeluna. I wondered how he happened to know anything about Loyola's wound. Having thus settled my opinion, I went on eating my dinner, when Auckland, who was sitting opposite to me, addressed my neighbour, "Mr. Macaulay. "will you drink a glass of wine?" I thought I should have dropped off my chair. It was MACAULAY, the man I had been so long most curious to see and to hear, whose genius, eloquence, astonishing knowledge, and diversified talents have excited my wonder and admiration for such a length of time, and here I had been sitting next to him, hearing him talk, and setting him down for a dull fellow. I felt as if he could have read my thoughts, and the perspiration burst from every pore of my face, and yet it was impossible not to be amused at the idea. It was not till Macaulay stood up that I was aware of all the vulgarity and ungainliness of his appearance; not a ray of intellect beams from his countenance; a lump of more ordinary clay never enclosed a powerful mind and lively imagination. He had a cold and sore throat, the latter of which occasioned a constant contraction of the muscles of the thorax, making him appear as if in momentary danger of a fit. His manner struck me as not pleasing, but it was not assuming, unembarrassed, yet not easy, unpolished, yet not coarse; there was no kind of usurpation of the conversation, no tenacity as to opinion or facts, no assumption of superiority, but the variety and extent of his information were soon apparent, for whatever subject was touched upon he evinced the utmost familiarity with it; quotation, illustration, anecdote, seemed ready in his hands for every topic. Primogeniture in this country, in others, and particularly in ancient Rome, was the principal topic, I think, but Macaulay was not certain what was the law of Rome, except that when a man died intestate his estate was

divided between his children. After dinner Talleyrand and Madame de Dino came in. He was introduced to Talleyrand, who told him that he meant to go to the House of Commons on Tuesday, and that he hoped he would speak, "qu'il avait entendu tous les grands orateurs, et il désirait à présent entendre Monsieur Macaulay." (Vol. ii. pp. 245-47.)

This was the first—here is the last—a comparison between Brougham and Macaulay in 1836:—

'Brougham, tall, thin, and commanding in figure, with a face which, however ugly, is full of expression, and a voice of great power, variety, and even melody, notwithstanding his occasional prolixity and tediousness, is an orator in every sense of the word. Macaulay, short, fat, and ungraceful, with a round, thick, unmeaning face, and with rather a lisp, though he has made speeches of great merit, and of a very high style of eloquence in point of composition, has no pretensions to be put in competition with Brougham in the House of Commons. Nor is the difference and the inferiority of Macaulay less marked in society. Macaulay, indeed, is a great talker, and pours forth floods of knowledge on all subjects; but the gracefulness, lightness, and variety are wanting in his talk which are so conspicuous in his writings; there is not enough of alloy in the metal of his conversation; it is too didactic, it is all too good, and not sufficiently flexible, plastic, and diversified for general society. Brougham, on the other hand, is all life, spirit, and gaiety—"from grave to gay, from lively to severe"—dashing through every description of folly and fun, dealing in those rapid transitions by which the attention and imagination are arrested and excited; always amusing, always instructive, never tedious, elevated to the height of the greatest intellect, and familiar with the most abstruse subjects, and at the same moment conciliating the humble pretensions of inferior minds by dropping into the midst of their pursuits and objects with a fervour and intensity of interest which surprises and delights his associates, and, above all, which puts them at their ease.

'[*Quantum mutatus!* All this has long ceased to be true of Brougham. Macaulay, without having either the wit or the *charm* which constitutes the highest kind of colloquial excellence or success, is a marvellous, an unrivalled (in his way), and a delightful talker.—1850.] (Vol. iii. pp. 338, 339.)

Of Sir James Mackintosh the journalist had the highest opinion, and never mentions him excepting with praise and admiration. The first notice of him is at a party at Middleton in 1819. Under date March 5, 1819, he says:—"The other night Sir James Mackintosh made a splendid speech on the 'Criminal Laws; it was temperate and eloquent, and excited 'universal admiration.' June 14:—"The other night in the 'House of Commons, on the Foreign Enlistment Bill, Sir 'James Mackintosh made a brilliant speech: all parties agree in 'commending it. Canning answered him, but not successfully.' (Vol. i. p. 20.) These were two great occasions. The tide

of public opinion has swept so thoroughly over the subject of the first as to have obliterated all traces of the abuses which the oration denounced, and has left only the wonder 'that such things ever were. The second has been too much forgotten; but those who are solicitous for the international law of the future may study it with profit as well as admiration. It contains an elucidation of principles too much neglected, illustrated and enforced with elegance and power; nor will it be long, we venture to predict, before its authority assumes a prominent place.

Sixteen years afterwards Mr. Greville thus moralises on the career and fate of one whose promise had been so brilliant:—

'We dined at Burghley on the way [to Doncaster], and got here at two on Sunday; read Mackintosh's *Life* in the carriage, which made me dreadfully disgusted with my racing *métier*. What a life as compared with mine!—passed among great and wise men, and intent on high thoughts and honourable aspirations, existing amidst interests far more pungent even than those which engage me, and of the futility of which I am for ever reminded. I am struck with the coincidence of the tastes and dispositions of Burke and Mackintosh, and of something in the mind of the one which bears an affinity to that of the other; but their characters—how different! their abilities—how unequal! yet both, how superior, even the weakest of the two, to almost all other men, and the success of each so little corresponding with his powers, neither having ever attained any object of ambition beyond that of fame. All their talents, therefore, and all their acquirements, did not procure them content, and probably Burke was a very unhappy, and Mackintosh not a very happy, man. The suavity, the indolent temperament, the "*mitis sapientia*" of Mackintosh may have warbled off sorrow and mitigated disappointment, but the stern and vindictive energies of Burke must have kept up a storm of conflicting passions in his breast. But I turn from Mackintosh and Burke to all that is vilest and foolishlest on earth, and among such I now pass my unprofitable hours. . . .

'I have finished Mackintosh's *Life* with great delight, and many painful sensations, together with wonder and amazement. His account of his reading is utterly incomprehensible to me; he must have been endowed with some superhuman faculty of transferring the contents of books to his own mind. He talks in his journals of reading volumes in a few hours which would seem to demand many days even from the most rapid reader. I have heard of Southey, who would read a book through as he stood in a bookseller's shop; that is, his eye would glance down the page, and by a process partly mechanical, partly intellectual, formed by long habit, he would extract in his synoptical passage all that he required to know. (Macaulay was, and George Lewis is, just as wonderful in this respect.) Some of the books that Mackintosh talks of, philosophical and metaphysical works, could not be so disposed of, and I should like much to know what his system or his secret was. . . .

‘What are we to think of the necessary connexion between intellectual superiority and official eminence, when we have seen the Duke of Richmond invited to be a member of the Cabinet, while Mackintosh was thrust into an obscure and subordinate office—Mackintosh placed under the orders of Charles Grant! Well might he regret that he had not been a professor, and, “with safer pride content,” adorned with unusual glory some academical chair. Then while he was instructing and delighting the world, there would have been many regrets and lamentations that such mighty talents were confined to such a narrow sphere, and innumerable speculations of the greatness he would have achieved in political life, and how the irresistible force of his genius and his eloquence must have raised him to the pinnacle of Parliamentary fame and political power.’ (Vol. iii. pp. 314–18.)

It is as difficult sometimes to say why a man succeeds as why he fails; but the reason in both instances lies, in the large proportion of cases, in the man himself. The race-horse may have speed, but if he cannot ‘stay’ he cannot win. The rewards of political life do not always fall to the brilliant or the learned. Mr. Greville says very truly, speaking of Brougham:—‘The life of a politician is probably one of deep mortification, for the race is not always to the swift, nor the battle to the strong; and few things can be more galling than to see men far inferior to ourselves enabled by fortune or circumstances to attain what we tried after in vain, and to learn from our own experience how many things there are in this life of greater practical utility than splendid abilities and unwearied industry.’ Mackintosh probably wanted vital energy, decision, and that adaptability which enables a man not only to say the right thing, but to say it at the right time, and above all, not to say it at the wrong time. But all must regret that his vast powers produced so slight an effect on his times, and have left so little which is commensurate behind them.

These are mere casual sketches. Before going on to the author’s more elaborate and finished portraits, we may extract the following incidental notices:—

‘Jan. 2nd, 1830.—At Rochampton; William Howard, Baring Wall, and Lady Pembroke’s son, the best sort of youth I have seen for a long while’ (vol. i. p. 261). This was Sidney Herbert, whose life and character, as the editor says, did not belie the promise of his youth. He was too early lost to the party with whom his lot was ultimately cast, and had he lived was destined to have played an important part in public affairs. But the author seems to have forgotten his early impressions, for we find him grumbling over his appointment as Secretary to the Board of Control in 1835. He says:—

‘Peel has just made Sidney Herbert Secretary to the Board of Con-



trol, an office of great labour and involving considerable business in the House of Commons. He is about twenty-two or twenty-three years old [he was twenty-four], unpractised in business, and never spoke but once in the House of Commons, when he made one of those pretty first speeches which prove little or nothing, and that was in opposition to the Dissenters. He may be very fit for this place, but it remains to be proved, and I am surprised he did not make him begin with a Lordship of the Treasury or some such thing, and put Gladstone, who is a very clever man, in that post. Praed is First Secretary to the Board of Control, and will do the business.' (Vol. iii. p. 194.)

The following is the only notice of the present Premier in these volumes :—

'December 6th.—The Chancellor called on me yesterday about getting young Disraeli into Parliament (through the means of George Bentinck) for Lynn. I had told him George wanted a good man to assist in turning out William Lennox, and he suggested the above-named gentleman, whom he called a friend of Chandos. His political principles must, however, be in abeyance, for he said, that Durham was doing all he could to get him by the offer of a seat, and so forth; if, therefore, he is undecided and wavering between Chandos and Durham, he must be a mighty impartial personage. I don't think such a man will do, though just such as Lyndhurst would be connected with.' (Vol. iii. p. 170.)

One or two more passages, taken nearly at random, may interest our readers :—

'I saw the day before yesterday a curious letter from Southey to Brougham, which some day or other will probably appear. Taylor showed it me. Brougham had written to him to ask him what his opinion was as to the encouragement that could be given to literature, by rewarding or honouring literary men, and suggested (I did not see his letter) that the *Guelphic* Order should be bestowed upon them. Southey's reply was very courteous, but in a style of suppressed irony and forced politeness, and exhibited the marks of a chafed spirit, which was kept down by an effort. "You, my Lord, are *now* on the Conservative side," was one of his phrases, which implied that the Chancellor had not always been on that side. He suggested that it might be useful to establish a sort of lay fellowships; 10,000*l.* would give 10 of 500*l.* and 25 of 200*l.*; but he proposed them not to reward the meritorious, but as a means of silencing or hiring the mischievous. It was evident, however, that he laid no stress on this plan, or considered it practicable, and only proposed it because he thought he must suggest something. He said that honours might be desirable to scientific men, as they were so considered on the Continent, and Newton and Davy had been titled, but for himself, if a *Guelphic* distinction was adopted, "he should be a *Ghibelline*." He ended by saying that all he asked for was a repeal of the Copyright Act, which took from the families of literary men the only property they had to give them, and this "I ask

"for with the earnestness of one who is conscious that he has laboured for posterity." It is a remarkable letter.' (Vol. ii. p. 112.)

'I am just come home from breakfasting with Henry Taylor to meet Wordsworth; the same party as when he had Southey—Mill, Elliot Charles Villiers. Wordsworth may be bordering on sixty; hard-featured, brown, wrinkled, with prominent teeth and a few scattered grey hairs, but nevertheless not a disagreeable countenance; and very cheerful, merry, courteous, and talkative, much more so than I should have expected from the grave and didactic character of his writings. He held forth on poetry, painting, politics, and metaphysics, and with a great deal of eloquence; he is more conversible and with a greater flow of animal spirits than Southey. He mentioned that he never wrote down as he composed, but composed walking, riding, or in bed, and wrote down after; that Southey always composes at his desk. He talked a great deal of Brougham, whose talents and domestic virtues he greatly admires; that he was very generous and affectionate in his disposition, full of duty and attention to his mother, and had adopted and provided for a whole family of his brother's children, and treats his wife's children as if they were his own. He insisted upon taking them both with him to the drawing-room the other day when he went in state as Chancellor. They remonstrated with him, but in vain.' (Vol. ii. p. 120.)

'Johnson liked Fox because he defended his pension, and said it was only to blame in not being large enough. "Fox," he said, "is a liberal man; he would always be "aut Cæsar aut nullus;" whenever I have seen him he has been *nullus*." Lord Holland said Fox made it a rule never to talk in Johnson's presence, because he knew all his conversations were recorded for publication, and he did not choose to figure in them.' (Vol. ii. p. 316.)

'January 22nd.—Dined with Talleyrand the day before yesterday. Nobody there but his *attachés*. After dinner he told me about his first residence in England, and his acquaintance with Fox and Pitt. He always talks in a kind of affectionate tone about the former, and is now meditating a visit to Mrs. Fox at St. Anne's Hill, where he may see her surrounded with the busts, pictures, and recollections of her husband. He delights to dwell on the simplicity, quietude, childishness, and profoundness of Fox. I asked him if he had ever known Pitt. He said that Pitt came to Rheims to learn French, and he was there at the same time on a visit to the Archbishop, his uncle (whom I remember at Hartwell).' (Vol. ii. p. 344.)

'September 10th.—At Gorhambury on Saturday till Monday. Dined on Friday with Talleyrand, a great dinner to M. Thiers, the French Minister of Commerce, a little man, about as tall as Shoil, and as mean and vulgar-looking, wearing spectacles, and with a squeaking voice. He was editor of the "National," an able writer, and one of the principal instigators of the Revolution of July. It is said that he is a man of great ability and a good speaker, more in the familiar English than the bombastical French style. Talleyrand has a high opinion of him. He wrote a history of the Revolution, which he now regrets; it is well done, but the doctrine of fatalism which he puts forth in it he thinks

calculated to injure his reputation as a statesman. I met him again at dinner at Talleyrand's yesterday with another great party, and last night he started on a visit to Birmingham and Liverpool.' (Vol. iii. p. 31.)

'Prince Esterhazy told me a great deal about the Duke of Reichstadt, who, if he had lived, would have probably played a great part in the world. He died of a premature decay, brought on apparently by over-exertion and over-excitement; his talents were very conspicuous, he was *pétri d'ambition*, worshipped the memory of his father, and for that reason never liked his mother; his thoughts were incessantly turned towards France, and when he heard of the days of July he said, "Why was I not there to take my chance?" He evinced great affection and gratitude to his grandfather, who, while he scrupulously observed all his obligations towards Louis Philippe, could not help feeling a secret pride in the aspiring genius and ambition of Napoleon's son. He was well educated, and day and night pored over the history of his father's glorious career. He delighted in military exercises, and not only shone at the head of his regiment, but had already acquired the hereditary art of ingratiating himself with the soldiers. Esterhazy told me one anecdote in particular, which shows the absorbing passion of his soul overpowering the usual propensities of his age. He was to make his first appearance in public at a ball at Lady Cowley's (to which he had shown great anxiety to go), and was burning with impatience to amuse himself with dancing and flirting with the beauties he had admired in the Prater. He went, but there he met two French marshals—Marmont and Maison. He had no eyes or ears but for them; from nine in the evening to five the next morning he devoted himself to these marshals, and conversed with them without ceasing. Though he knew well enough all the odium that attached to Marmont, he said to him that he was too happy to have the opportunity of making the acquaintance of one who had been among his father's earliest companions, and who could tell him so many interesting details of his earlier days. Marmont subsequently either did give or was to have given him lessons in strategy.' (Vol. iii. pp. 374, 375.)

These are examples, and almost every page would furnish others equally interesting, of the varied contents of these volumes. As we have shown, the author is not always right; but at least he speaks his mind, as he formed it at the time, and photographs vividly the lights and shadows as they passed.

The more studied descriptions are those of Canning, Wellington, Peel, Brougham, Grey, Lyndhurst, Stanley, and O'Connell; and of his estimate of these distinguished men we shall say a few words. In regard to all of them there is an infusion of the cynical in the style in which he writes of them; nor does he spare hard words to express his disfavour. But when all the passages are put together, as forming his ultimate opinion, as we have already said, they rather gain than suffer

at the critic's hands. On the whole, the author's sympathies seem to have been more with Canning than with any of the great statesmen he mentions. He admired his genius, which all did, but he seems to have had a higher estimate of his qualities as a Minister than has always been accorded him by posterity. We are inclined to think that in this respect Mr. Greville does him no more than justice. The natural liberality of his mind, and his perspicacious insight into the present and future, were heavily weighted by his past political career and associates. Had he survived he would probably have been a great Minister; although it is quite possible that the popularity he would have acquired might have delayed longer the strong exhibition of public opinion which carried the Catholic Relief Bill and the Reform Bill. Mr. Greville allows him little weight of character: but the atmosphere of the Court of George IV. was not favourable to the highest forms of political integrity, and the dislike of many of the Tory party was probably as much owing to his want of fortune and aristocratic connexion, combined with the Liberal tendency of his views, as it was to any supposed shortcoming in that respect.

There is no better account extant of the circumstances which led to the dissolution of Lord Liverpool's Government, and the formation of that of Canning, than that which is contained in the first and second of these volumes. The author does not appear to have been much acquainted with Canning, but he was so with many of his friends, in particular with Lord George Bentinck, who was his private secretary, of whom he says that he did not believe such another man as Canning ever existed. After relating the details of his illness and death, the seeds of which were sown at the Duke of York's funeral, he goes on:—

'Canning concealed nothing from Mrs. Canning, nor from Charles Ellis. When absent from Mrs. C. he wrote everything to her in the greatest detail. Canning's industry was such that he never left a moment unemployed, and such was the clearness of his head that he could address himself almost at the same time to several different subjects with perfect precision and without the least embarrassment. He wrote very fast, but not fast enough for his mind, composing much quicker than he could commit his ideas to paper. He could not bear to dictate, because nobody could write fast enough for him; but on one occasion, when he had the gout in his hand and could not write, he stood by the fire and dictated at the same time a despatch on Greek affairs to George Bentinck and one on South American politics to Howard de Walden, each writing as fast as he could, while he turned from one to the other without hesitation or embarrassment.' (Vol. i. p. 106.)

'The Duke of Wellington talked of Canning the other day a great deal at my mother's. He said his talents were astonishing, his compositions admirable, that he possessed the art of saying exactly what was necessary, and passing over those topics on which it was not advisable to touch, his fertility and resources inexhaustible. He thought him the finest speaker he had ever heard; though he prided himself extremely upon his compositions, he would patiently endure any criticisms upon such papers as he submitted for the consideration of the Cabinet, and would allow them to be altered in any way that was suggested; he (the Duke) particularly had often "cut and hacked" his papers, and Canning never made the least objection, but was always ready to adopt the suggestions of his colleagues. It was not so, however, in conversation and discussion. Any difference of opinion or dissent from his views threw him into ungovernable rage, and on such occasions he flew out with a violence which, the Duke said, had often compelled him to be silent that he might not be involved in bitter personal altercation. He said that Canning was usually very silent in the Cabinet, seldom spoke at all, but when he did he maintained his opinions with extraordinary tenacity. He said that he was one of the idlest of men. This I do not believe, for I have always heard that he saw everything and did everything himself. Not a despatch was received that he did not read, nor one written that he did not dictate or correct.' (Vol. i. pp. 167, 168.)

Mr. Greville suggests that the Duke of Wellington disliked and suspected Canning, because at the time of the breaking up of the Liverpool Government he thought he was negotiating with the Whigs: in which surmise perhaps there was some truth. He also states, on the authority of Lord George Bentinck, that the recognition of the South American Republics was opposed by the Duke of Wellington, and was very distasteful to the King; who, however, was reconciled to it in the end, and took credit for it. Of the celebrated speech 'I called a new world into existence to redress the balance of the old,' Mr. Greville says 'the "I" was not relished.'

With all his admiration, however, for the man, his summary of his character is, as usual, severe. He says (vol. i. p. 267), writing in 1830, 'I believe it to be impossible for a man of squeamish and uncompromising virtue to be a successful politician;' and he proceeds as follows:—

'If Canning had had a fair field, he would have done great things, for his lofty and ambitious genius took an immense sweep, and the vigour of his intellect, his penetration and sagacity, enabled him to form mighty plans and work them out with success; but it is impossible to believe that he was a high-minded man, that he spurned everything that was dishonest, uncandid, and ungentlemanlike; he was not above trick and intrigue, and this was the fault of his character, which was unequal to his genius and understating. (However, notwithstand-

ing his failings he was the greatest man we have had for a long time, and if life had been spared to him, and opposition had not been too much for him, he would have raised our character abroad, and perhaps found remedies for our difficulties at home. What a difference between his position and that of the Duke of Wellington's! Everybody is disposed to support the latter and give him unlimited credit for good intentions. 'The former was obliged to carry men's approbation by storm, and the moment he had failed, or been caught tripping, he would have been lost.' (Vol. i. p. 268.)

These are strong expressions, probably too strong for the subject of them, although they may truly indicate where his political character was weakest. The unquestionable personal influence which Canning acquired, when he wished, seems inconsistent with the absence of high spirit; and there are many things in this book which go far to produce the opposite impression.

The Duke of Wellington is the principal figure in these volumes. The author lived on terms of intimacy with him, and was admitted to much of his confidence. So close an observer could not fail to see the faults and weaknesses, if such there were, as well as the great and noble qualities he possessed. Nor does he escape the censor's lash, laid on in unmeasured terms. But we are bound to say, after reading this very curious record of his political life, for the book embraces a large proportion of it, that differing as we have always done from the politics of the Duke of Wellington, we think he comes out of the scrutiny entirely untarnished, a high-minded, patriotic man, bound up no doubt with the movements and even the intrigues of his party, but for the most holding his head loftily above them, and always ready to sacrifice his personal ends to what might seem to be the general benefit. Mr. Greville does not always seem to give him this credit, but we think he comes to this conclusion in the end.

Mr. Greville follows the Duke of Wellington's political career with considerable minuteness from the breaking up of the Liverpool administration in 1826, to the conclusion of this part of the *Journal* in 1837. Sometimes he is full of praise and admiration: sometimes very critical and disparaging, but in the end his respect and veneration for the Duke far preponderate over every other consideration. He says of his position in 1829, when at the head of the Government, and during the debates on the Catholic Relief Bill:—

'The fact is, he is a man of great energy, decision, and authority, and his character has been formed by the events of his life, and by the extraordinary circumstances which have raised him to a situation higher than any subject has attained in modern times. That his great

influence is indispensable to carry this question, and therefore most useful at this time, cannot be doubted, for he can address the King in a style which no other Minister could adopt. He treats with him as with an equal, and the King stands completely in awe of him. It will be long before a correct and impartial estimate is formed of the Duke's character and abilities; his talents, however, must be of a very superior, though not of the most shining description. Whatever he may be, he is at this moment one of the most powerful Ministers this country has ever seen.' (Vol. i. p. 176.)

He praises his style of speaking frequently. 'I like his speaking: it is so much to the point: no nonsense and verbiage about it, and he says strongly and simply what he has to say' (vol. i. p. 278).

The first elaborate criticism on his political character occurs in 1830, when revolution was striding over Europe, and all was anxiety and foreboding. He says:—

'In these difficult circumstances, and in the midst of possibilities so tremendous, it is awful to reflect upon the very moderate portion of wisdom and sagacity which is allotted to those by whom our affairs are managed. I am by no means easy as to the Duke of Wellington's sufficiency to meet such difficulties; the habits of his mind are not those of patient investigation, profound knowledge of human nature, and cool, discriminating sagacity. He is exceedingly quick of apprehension, but deceived by his own quickness into thinking he knows more than he does. He has amazing confidence in himself, which is fostered by the deference of those around him and the long experience of his military successes. He is upon ordinary occasions right-headed and sensible, but he is beset by weaknesses and passions which must, and continually do, blind his judgment. Above all he wants that suavity of manner, that watchfulness of observation, that power of taking great and enlarged views of events and characters, and of weighing opposite interests and probabilities, which are essentially necessary in circumstances so delicate, and in which one false step, any hasty measure, or even incautious expression, may be attended with consequences of immense importance. I feel justified in this view of his political fitness by contemplating the whole course of his career, and the signal failure which has marked all his foreign policy. If Canning was now alive we might hope to steer through these difficulties, but if he had lived we should probably never have been in them. He was the only statesman who had sagacity to enter into and comprehend the spirit of the times, and to put himself at the head of that movement which was no longer to be arrested. The march of Liberalism (as it is called) would not be stopped, and this he knew, and he resolved to govern and lead instead of opposing it. The idiots who so rejoiced at the removal of this master mind (which alone could have saved them from the effects of their own folly) thought to stem the torrent in its course, and it has overwhelmed them. It is unquestionable that the Duke has too much participated in their sentiments and passions, and, though he never

mixed himself with their proceedings, regarded them with a favourable eye, nor does he ever seem to have been aware of the immensity of the peril which they were incurring. The urgency of the danger will unquestionably increase the impatience of those who already think the present Government incapable of carrying on the public business, and now that we are placed in a situation the most intricate (since the French Revolution) it is by no means agreeable to think that such enormous interests are at the mercy of the Duke's awkward squad.' (Vol. ii. pp. 41, 42.)

This is followed by a still sharper condemnation of him as a Minister when his government came to an end in the end of 1830. He says of him:—

'His is one of those mixed characters which it is difficult to praise or blame without the risk of doing them more or less than justice. He has talents which the event has proved to be sufficient to make him the second (and, now that Napoleon is gone, the first) general of the age, but which could not make him a tolerable Minister. Confident, presumptuous, and dictatorial, but frank, open, and good-humoured, he contrived to rule in the Cabinet without mortifying his colleagues, and he has brought it to ruin without forfeiting their regard. Choosing with a very slender stock of knowledge to take upon himself the sole direction of every department of Government, he completely sank under the burden. Originally imbued with the principles of Lord Castlereagh and the Holy Alliance, he brought all those predilections with him into office. Incapable of foreseeing the mighty events with which the future was big, and of comprehending the prodigious alteration which the moral character of Europe had undergone, he pitted himself against Canning in the Cabinet, and stood up as the assertor of maxims both of foreign and domestic policy which that great statesman saw were no longer fitted for the times we live in.' (Vol. ii. p. 81.)

The remainder of the passage is still more severe, but it ends with this note:—

'[*Memorandum added by Mr. Greville in April 1850.*]

'N.B.—I leave this as it is, though it is unjust to the Duke of Wellington; but such as my impressions were at the time they shall remain, to be corrected afterwards when necessary. It would be very wrong to impute *selfishness* to him in the ordinary sense of the term. He coveted power, but he was perfectly disinterested, a great patriot if ever there was one, and he was always animated by a strong and abiding sense of duty. I have done him justice in other places, and there is after all a great deal of truth in what I have said here.' (Vol. i. p. 84.)

He resumes the subject again in 1831, at considerable length: laments that the Tory party should have its deliberations ruled by the obstinacy and prejudices of the Duke. Again he adds a note, dated in 1838, but thinks he has not done him



injustice. He says afterwards (vol. ii. p. 305), June 1, 1831, that he met the Duke of Wellington at dinner yesterday and afterwards had a long talk with him, not on politics. 'I never see and converse with him without reproaching myself for the sort of hostility I feel and express towards his political conduct; for there are a simplicity, a gaiety, and natural urbanity and good humour in him which are remarkably captivating in so great a man.' The critic's heart is still further softened as this volume proceeds; for in 1833, on the occasion of a ride with him through St. James's Park, and in relation to the respect evinced to him by the public, he says:—

'Much, too, as I have regretted and censured the enormous errors of his political career (at times), I believe that this sentiment is in a great degree produced by the justice which is done to his political character, sometimes mistaken, but always high-minded and patriotic, and never mean, false, or selfish. If he has aimed at power, and overrated his own capacity for wielding it, it has been with the purest intentions, and the most conscientious views.' (Vol. ii. p. 373.)

Putting epithets and adjectives aside, in which he deals much too freely, the picture Mr. Greville gives us of the Duke of Wellington as a politician and a minister is graphic, and we think not far from just. His pride in his own quickness and decision, his tenacity where he thought he could succeed, and his courage in yielding where he saw he could not; his sympathy with old absolutist principles, and yet a clear-sighted prevision that their day was nearly over; the entire fearlessness and courage of the man, and his patriotic loyalty to his sovereign and his country, come out in the end in the most distinct colours. He was not a great politician, or a great minister, in any sense. His views of policy were not large, and he had no popular leanings or sympathies. But he was, in addition to being a great soldier, a very clever man; and both his natural simplicity of character, and what he felt due to his great reputation, raised him above much of the littleness of party.

More interesting to us than Mr. Greville's estimate of his political career are one or two notices of conversations with him on some of his military performances.

The following, as reported at first hand from the Duke of Wellington himself, are well worth transcribing:—

'Upon one occasion only the Spaniards gained a victory, the day on which St. Sebastian was stormed. Soult attacked a Spanish corps commanded by General Freyre. When the Duke was informed of the attack he hastened to the scene of action and placed two British divisions in reserve, to support the Spaniards, but did not allow them to

come into action. He found the Spaniards running away as fast as they could. He asked them where they were going. They said they were taking off the wounded. He immediately sent and ordered the gates of Irun, to which they were flying, to be shut against them, and sent to Freyre to desire him to rally his men. This was done, and they sustained the attack of the French; but General Freyre sent to the Duke to beg he would let his divisions support him, as he could not maintain himself much longer. The Duke said to Freyre's aide-de-camp, "If I let a single man fire, the English will swear they gained the victory, and he had much better do it all himself; besides, look through my glass, and you will see the French are retreating." This was the case, for a violent storm of rain had occurred, and the French, who had crossed a river, finding that it began to swell, and that their bridges were in danger of being carried away, had begun to retreat. The Spaniards maintained their position, but the Duke said he believed they owed it to the storm more than to their own resolution.' (Vol. i. p. 69.)

'The Duke said he had been struck down by a musket shot whilst reconnoitring the enemy as they were retreating in the Pyrenees. The people round him thought he was killed, but he got up directly. Alava was wounded a few minutes before him, and Major Brooke nearly at the same time. He is of opinion that Massena was the best French general to whom he was ever opposed.

'He said that Bonaparte had not the patience requisite for defensive operations. His last campaign (before the capture of Paris) was very brilliant, probably the ablest of all his performances. The Duke is of opinion that if he had possessed greater patience he would have succeeded in compelling the Allies to retreat; but they had adopted so judicious a system of defence that he was foiled in the impetuous attacks he made upon them, and after a partial failure which he met with, when he attacked Blücher at Laon and Craon, he got tired of pursuing a course which afforded no great results, and leaving a strong body under Marmont to watch Blücher, he threw himself into the rear of the Grand Army. The march upon Paris entirely disconcerted him and finished the war. The Allies could not have maintained themselves much longer, and had he continued to keep his force concentrated, and to carry it as occasion required against one or other of the two armies, the Duke thinks he must eventually have forced them to retreat, and that their retreat would have been a difficult operation. The British army could not have reached the scene of operations for two months. The Allies did not dare attack Napoleon; if he had himself come up he should certainly have attacked him, for his army was the best that ever existed.' (Vol. i. pp. 71, 72.)

'*Whersted*, December 10th.—I left Woburn on Thursday night last, and got here on Friday morning. The Lievens, Worcesters, Duke of Wellington, Neumann, and Montagu were here. The Duke went away yesterday. We acted charades, which were very well done. Yesterday we went to shoot at Sir Philip Brooke's. As we went in the carriage, the Duke talked a great deal about the battle of Waterloo and different things relating to that campaign. He said that he had

50,000 men at Waterloo. He began the campaign with 85,000 men, lost 5,000 men on the 16th, and had a corps of 20,000 men at Hal under Prince Frederick. He said that it was remarkable that nobody who had ever spoken of these operations had ever made mention of that corps, and Bonaparte was certainly ignorant of it. In this corps were the best of the Dutch troops; it had been placed there because the Duke expected the attack to be made on that side. He said that the French army was the best army that was ever seen, and that in the previous operations Bonaparte's march upon Belgium was the finest thing ever was done—so rapid and so well combined. His object was to beat the armies in detail, and this object succeeded in so far as that he attacked them separately; but from the extraordinary celerity with which the allied armies were got together he was not able to realise the advantages he had promised himself. The Duke says that they certainly were not prepared for this attack, as the French had previously broken up the roads by which their army advanced; but as it was in summer this did not render them impassable. He says that Bonaparte beat the Prussians in a most extraordinary way, as the battle was gained in less than four hours; but that it would probably have been more complete if he had brought a greater number of troops into action, and not detached so large a body against the British corps. There were 40,000 men opposed to the Duke on the 16th, but he says that the attack was not so powerful as it ought to have been with such a force. The French had made a long march the day before the battle, and had driven in the Prussian posts in the evening. I asked him if he thought Bonaparte had committed any fault. He said he thought he had committed a fault in attacking him in the position of Waterloo; that his object ought to have been to remove him as far as possible from the Prussian army, and that he ought consequently to have moved upon Hal, and to have attempted to penetrate by the same road by which the Duke had himself advanced. He had always calculated upon Bonaparte's doing this, and for this purpose he had posted 20,000 men under Prince Frederick at Hal. He said that the position at Waterloo was uncommonly strong, but that the strength of it consisted alone in the two farms of Hougoumont and La Haye Sainte, both of which were admirably situated and adapted for defence. In Hougoumont there were never more than from 300 to 500 men, who were reinforced as it was necessary; and although the French repeatedly attacked this point, and sometimes with not less than 20,000 men, they never could even approach it. Had they obtained possession of it, they could not have maintained it, as it was open on one side to the whole fire of the English lines, whilst it was sheltered on the side towards the French. The Duke said the farm of La Haye Sainte was still better than that of Hougoumont, and that it never would have been taken if the officer who was commanding there had not neglected to make an aperture through which ammunition could be conveyed to his garrison.' (Vol. i. pp. 39-41.)

On the occurrence of, the French Revolution in 1830, Marmont came to London, and Mr. Greville had more than one

conversation with him on military affairs. It is interesting to compare his account of the position of the contending forces in the campaign of 1814 with that of the Duke of Wellington.

*'At night.—*Went to Lady Glengall's to meet Marmont. He likes talking of his adventures, but he had done his Paris talk before I got there; however, he said a great deal about old campaigning and Bonaparte, which, as well as I recollect, I will put down:

*'As to the battle of Salamanca, he remarked that, without meaning to detract from the glory of the English arms, he was inferior in force there; our army was provided with everything, well paid, and the country favourable, his "dénudé de tout," without pay, in a hostile country; that all his provisions came from a great distance and under great escorts, and his communications were kept up in the same way. I repeated what the Duke of Wellington had once told me, that if the Emperor had continued the same plan, and fallen back on Paris, he would have obliged the Allies to retreat, and asked him what he thought. He rather agreed with this, but said the Emperor had conceived one of the most splendid pieces of strategy that ever had been devised, which failed by the disobedience of Eugene. He sent orders to Eugene to assemble his army, in which he had 35,000 French troops, to amuse the Austrians by a negotiation for the evacuation of Italy; to throw the Italian troops into Alexandria and Mantua; to destroy the other fortresses, and going by forced marches with his French troops, force the passage of Mont Cenis, collect the scattered *corps d'armée* of Augereau (who was near Lyons) and another French general, which would make his force amount to above 60,000 men, and burst upon the rear of the Allies so as to cut off all their communications. These orders he sent to Eugene, but Eugene "rêvait d'être roi d'Italie après sa chute," and he sent his aide-de-camp Tascher to excuse himself. The movement was not made, and the game was up. Lady Dudley Stewart was there, Lucien's daughter and Bonaparte's niece. Marmont was presented to her, and she heard him narrate all this; there is something very simple, striking, and soldierlike in his manner and appearance. He is going to Russia.'* (Vol. ii. pp. 33-6.)

Turning to the Duke of Wellington's comrade and colleague, Sir Robert Peel, we find his career, merits, and character as clearly delineated and as sharply canvassed as those of the hero of Waterloo: the same infusion of asperity, and the same unreserved acknowledgment of his undoubted power and ability. There is this difference, that while the author knew and liked the Duke of Wellington, he does not seem to have been on terms of familiarity with Peel (as indeed very few people were) or to have found him congenial. He only once speaks of meeting him in society, and thus describes him:—

*'November 13th, 1833.—*To Buckenham, where I met Sir Robert Peel. He is very agreeable in society. It is a toss-up whether he

talks or not; but if he thaws, and is in good humour and spirits, he is lively, entertaining, and abounding in anecdotes, which he tells extremely well.' (Vol. iii. p. 35.)

We infer from this that he was not one of his intimates, or we should not have had to wait till the third volume for this testimony to his conversational powers, which we believe to be entirely deserved. To his debating ability he does ample but rather unwilling justice; but grumbles at his cold temperament, and condemns his political inconsistency. Among many notices of his political career, few of them without considerable indications of dislike, or at least distaste, the following account of the position which he occupied in 1834 is the most elaborate, and on the whole the fairest:—

'Peel's is an enviable position; in the prime of life, with an immense fortune, *facile princeps* in the House of Commons, unshackled by party connexions and prejudices, universally regarded as the ablest man, and with (on the whole) a very high character, free from the cares of office, able to devote himself to literature, to politics, or idleness, as the fancy takes him. No matter how unruly the House, how impatient or fatigued, the moment he rises all is silence, and he is sure of being heard with profound attention and respect. This is the enjoyable period of his life, and he must make the most of it, for when time and the hour shall bring about his return to power, his cares and anxieties will begin, and with whatever success his ambition may hereafter be crowned, he will hardly fail to look back with regret to this holiday time of his political career. How free and light he must feel at being liberated from the shackles of his old connexions, and at being able to take any part that his sense of his own interests or of the public exigencies may point out! And then the satisfactory consciousness of being by far the most eminent man in the House of Commons, to see and feel the respect he inspires and the consideration he enjoys. It is a melancholy proof of the decadence of ability and eloquence in that House, when Peel is the first, and, except Stanley, almost the only real orator in it. He speaks with great energy, great dexterity—his language is powerful and easy; he reasons well, hits hard, and replies with remarkable promptitude and effect; but he is at an immense distance below the great models of eloquence, Pitt, Fox, and Canning; his voice is not melodious, and it is a little monotonous; his action is very ungraceful, his person and manner are vulgar, and he has certain tricks in his motions which exhibit that vulgarity in a manner almost offensive, and which is only redeemed by the real power of his speeches. His great merit consists in his judgment, tact and discretion, his facility, promptitude, thorough knowledge of the assembly he addresses, familiarity with the details of every sort of Parliamentary business, and the great command he has over himself. He never was a great favourite of mine, but I am satisfied that he is the fittest man to be Minister, and I therefore wish to see him return to power.' (Vol. iii. pp. 64, 65.)

This tribute is to a considerable extent extorted: for in

many prior passages he looks rather with alarm than pleasure to his future power. In 1835, we have this renewed testimony to his ascendancy in debate:—

‘On Friday night, on the debate upon Irish Tithes, Peel howled down his opponents, Howick, Rice, and Thomson, like so many nine-pins; for, besides his vigour and power in debate, his memory is so tenacious and correct, that they never can make any mistakes without his detecting them; and he is inconceivably ready in all references to former debates and their incidents, and the votes and speeches of individual members. It cannot be denied that he is a great performer in his present part. Old Sir Robert, who must have been a man of exceeding shrewdness, predicted that his full energies would never be developed till he was in the highest place, and had the sole direction of affairs; and his brother Lawrence, who told this to Henry de Ros, said that in early youth he evinced the same obstinate and unsocial disposition, which has since been so remarkable a feature of his character. I wish he was not hampered with the Irish Church fetters, which he cannot throw off.’ (Vol. iii. pp. 232, 233.)

In the prior references to Peel there is a suggestion, apparently quite falsified by the event, that there had been a momentary coolness between him and the Duke of Wellington, arising out of Peel’s refusal to join the Government which the Duke attempted to form in May 1832. In one passage he attributes to Lord Lyndhurst the following description of the demeanour of the two great chiefs at the Cabinet:—‘That in the Cabinet, he (the Duke of Wellington) was always candid and reasonable; not so Peel. He, if his opinion was not adopted, would take up a newspaper and sulk.’ And again, in reference to the resignation of Lord Grey in 1832, of which the author gives a long and curious account, he says:—‘No cordiality, however, can exist again between him (Peel) and the Duke and his friends; and should the Whig Government be expelled, the animosity and disunion engendered by these circumstances, will make it extremely difficult to form a Tory administration.’ He adds, however, this note:—‘In a short time it was all made up—forgiven if not forgotten.’ (Vol. iii. p. 328.)

Taken as a whole, however, the part of the criticism on this great statesman’s political character which seems to us to be most substantially just is that on the consistency of his public conduct. The rest had doubtless some foundation in the temperament of the man; but the strong expressions which our author applied to him, as those in which he sometimes speaks of the Duke of Wellington, must be taken as the expression of a momentary impression rather than his deliberate opinion. Peel was quite capable of attaching, and he did attach to him

a circle of warm and devoted followers, whom his sagacity singled out to be, and who have since proved, leaders of affairs and of opinion in this country. So far was he, as our author suggests, from being cold to the rising statesmen of the day, he chiefly, if not alone of the ministers of this century, fostered the early promise of public men—a great quality in the leader of a party, and one too often neglected. He outlived the unfavourable impressions which his course on the Catholic Relief Bill had created, and which his resolute and manly policy on the Corn Laws entirely overshadowed; and went down to his untimely grave honoured and lamented by all parties, leaving behind him the fame, not of a great debater merely, but of a great and successful Minister.

Our space will not allow us to follow out in the same detail the other prominent portraits in the gallery. That of Lord Stanley, the future Lord Derby, is, perhaps, nearer the truth than most of them. Mr. Greville is too disparaging and severe in some of the epithets which he applies to Lord Grey; nor can a Whig read without something of indignation the slighting terms in which he speaks of one to whom the Liberal party and the country owe so deep a debt of gratitude. That a statesman who had won his early laurels forty years before, and had held the banner flying through many dark years of depression and desertion—who had earned the rest which he coveted, as he himself said,

‘Bankrupt of life, yet prodigal of ease,’—

should have felt the troubles and intrigues of the stormy period of 1831 press hardly on his nerves, or even on his temper, is neither wonderful, nor a fit subject for sarcasm. Yet Mr. Greville does ample justice to his great oratorical power; and those who venerate his memory might find the fullest testimony to the constancy, fidelity, and loftiness of his character in the narrative which these volumes contain. Mr. Greville justly calls him ‘the most finished orator of the day’ (vol. ii. p. 88). He tells the following anecdote, illustrative of his intellectual vigour:—

‘Stanley said there would be a great speech from Lord Grey, talked of his power in that line, thought his reply at five in the morning on the Catholic question the most perfect speech that ever was made. He would rather have made it than four of Lord Brougham’s. He gave the following instance of Lord Grey’s readiness and clear-headed accuracy. In one of the debates on the West India question, he went to Stanley, who was standing under the gallery, and asked him on what calculation he had allotted the sum of twenty millions. Stanley explained to him a complicated series of figures, of terms of years,

interest, compound interest, value of labour, &c., after which Lord Grey went back to his place, rose, and went through the whole with as much clearness and precision as if all these details had been familiar to his mind.' (Vol. iii. p. 10.)

He adds, 'It is very extraordinary that he should unite so much oratorical and parliamentary power with such weakness of character. He is a long way from a great man after all.' So Mr. Greville says of him as of most of his contemporaries; but his vision was narrowed by too close vicinity to his object. The country has judged him differently, and nothing in these volumes will disturb their verdict.

The author reserves all the vials of his asperity for his character of Brougham. Full of unspeakable admiration for his transcendent and wonderful ability, and of scorn, contempt, and denunciation of his conduct and motives, are the many pages which he devotes to an analysis of the qualities of that most extraordinary man. The following is the first impression of him described in the *Journal*, in 1828:—

'About three weeks ago I passed a few days at Panshanger, where I met Brougham; he came from Saturday till Monday morning, and from the hour of his arrival to that of his departure he never ceased talking. The party was agreeable enough—Luttrell, Rogers, &c.—but it was comical to see how the latter was provoked at Brougham's engrossing all the talk, though he could not help listening with pleasure. Brougham is certainly one of the most remarkable men I ever met; to say nothing of what he is in the world, his almost childish gaiety and animal spirits, his humour mixed with sarcasm, but not ill-natured, his wonderful information, and the facility with which he handles every subject, from the most grave and severe to the most trifling, displaying a mind full of varied and extensive information and a memory which has suffered nothing to escape it, I never saw any man whose conversation impressed me with such an idea of his superiority over all others. As Rogers said the morning of his departure, "This morning Solon, Lycurgus, Demosthenes, Archimedes, Sir Isaac Newton, Lord Chesterfield, and a great many more went away in one postchaise." ' (Vol. ii. pp. 117, 118.)

Even then, however, he adds:—'After all Brougham is only a living and very remarkable instance of the inefficacy of the most splendid talents, unless they are accompanied with other qualities which scarcely admit of definition, but which must serve the same purpose that ballast does for a ship.' Subsequently, in 1830, he writes, after the formation of the Grey Government:—

'November 22nd.—[The day on which Brougham took his seat on the Woolsack.] Dined yesterday at Sefton's; nobody there but Lord Grey and his family, Brougham and Montrond, the latter just come



from Paris. It was excessively agreeable. Lord Grey in excellent spirits, and Brougham, whom Sefton bantered from the beginning to the end of dinner. Be Brougham's political errors what they may, his gaiety, temper, and admirable social qualities make him delightful, to say nothing of his more solid merits, of liberality, generosity, and charity; for charity it is to have taken the whole family of one of his brothers who is dead—nine children—and maintained and educated them.' (Vol. ii. p. 69.)

Four years after, the following entry occurs, which is creditable to the writer's candour if it be not in some part, at least, a key to his sentiments:—

'His friends think him much altered in spirits and appearance: he has never shaken off his unhappiness at his brother's death, to whom he seems to have been tenderly attached. It is only justice to acknowledge his virtues in private life, which are unquestionably conspicuous. I am conscious of having often spoken of him with asperity, and it is some satisfaction to my conscience to do him this justice. When the greatest (I will not say the best) men are often influenced by pique or passion, by a hundred petty feelings which their philosophy cannot silence or their temperament obeys, it is no wonder that we poor wretches who are cast in less perfect moulds should be still more liable to these pernicious influences; and it is only by keeping an habitual watch over our own minds and thoughts, and steadily resolving never to be turned from considerations of justice and truth, that we can hope to walk through life with integrity and impartiality. I believe what I have said of Brougham to be correct in the main—that he is false, tricking, ambitious, and unprincipled, and as such I will show him up when I can—but though I do not like him and he has offended me—that is, has wounded my vanity (the greatest of all offences)—I only feel it the more necessary on that account to be on my guard against my own impressions and prejudices, and to take every opportunity of exhibiting the favourable side of the picture, and render justice to the talents and virtues which cannot be denied him.' (Vol. iii. pp. 76, 77.)

The author, in his narrative, traces very graphically Brougham's remarkable career, from the period of the Queen's trial, until his great and as it proved permanent downfall in 1835. To his wonderful powers of debate he is never tired of recurring; and in one passage, on the Irish Church Bill, when Peel and Stanley had it all their own way, he wonders how it would flutter the Conservative camp could they have but one half hour of Brougham.

Of the charges of insincerity and treachery which so often recur in these volumes it is needless to speak here. It is not the first time they have been made; but Mr. Greville leaves us, as others have left us, much in the dark as to the specific acts on which they have been founded. Some things, however, are plain enough. Brougham certainly wanted ballast, as Mr.

Greville said. There was a dash of eccentricity and excitable restlessness which tinged all his career. He was sharp in speech, and cared not sometimes if he trod on the tenderest susceptibilities even of those intimate with him. He did not like 'a brother near the throne,' and was jealous, as well as ambitious when his own advancement was in question. He was volatile, reckless, and forgetful, one set of ideas driving out their predecessors in marvellous succession. Such a one makes enemies in the mere wantonness of power and excitement. But of his relations with the Whig party in 1830 Mr. Greville gives us some revelations. When we find members of the party he had led to victory in the House of Commons rejoicing that his wings were clipped and his influence neutralised by his removal to the Lords, can we much wonder that when he discovered this he meditated some reprisals? The want of confidence was not entirely on one side, if this picture be true, nor could those expect party loyalty who failed to give it. If Brougham was jealous of others, others were jealous of him; and without believing, with Mr. Greville, that the insult of being offered the post of Attorney-General was the source of the discontent, we do not think the causes of the ultimate result require any mystery to be solved to ascertain them. Brougham was probably a restless uncomfortable colleague, given to indiscreet remarks, and not prone to conceal or refrain from ridicule or contempt. In or out of season his arrogant and imperious spirit was impatient of control, and despised inferior minds, the greatest mistake a man who aspires to leadership can commit. Finding himself only welcomed because he could not be excluded, he naturally looked to strengthen his own position, perhaps not regarding much that of others who were ready to sacrifice him. All this does not necessarily imply the imputation of perfidious conduct, although having thrown for the stake and lost, it is not surprising that he was not allowed his revenge. The retrospect is sad enough; but in the memory of what he did, we had rather not remember what faint friends, more than open enemies, have sometimes accused him of doing.

O'Connell and Lyndhurst are the remaining portraits, both very well painted. O'Connell's rise and reign form very prominent features in the book; his immense influence, his social position, and extraordinary power of popular speaking are first recounted. Then comes the Clare election, and Mr. Greville concludes he will fail in the House. Then he speaks from the bar of the House, and Mr. Greville concludes that he will succeed. The rest of his career, or at least that which was

the most important part of it, is fully narrated, and the character of the great agitator given in too minute detail for us to transcribe. Mr. Greville met him once in society, and says of him that there was nothing remarkable in his conversation, but that he seemed well bred and at his ease. O'Connell indeed was entirely a man of the world, and was of mark in any society he entered.

Lord Lyndhurst, as he appears in the scattered notices in the *Journal*, is a livelier sketch. There are few hard words about him, and much pleasant and lively talk recorded. His politics sat very lightly on him; he was not trammelled by earnestness or enthusiasm of any kind; had a genial sparkling spirit which was sympathetic with that of the journalist, and no very fixed or unbending opinions. It was new to us to know, as Mr. Greville informs us, that Lord Grey would have made Lyndhurst Chancellor if he could. We cannot pause over the characteristic traces of this most accomplished and remarkable man which many pages of these volumes contain. They are all refreshing and agreeable, and contrast pleasantly with the sombre shades which Mr. Greville has frequently on his palette. Sombre as they are, however, these are the tints in which a keen observer can hardly fail to depict what he sees around him in social and political life. Mr. Greville's highest merit, as a chronicler of his times, seems to us to be his searching analysis of *character*. With inimitable penetration and with great felicity of style, he has drawn his contemporaries as they were. It is the rarest quality in a writer of history to trace such portraits alike without concealment and without malice, and we doubt not that they will go down to posterity as they are depicted in these pages.

To some persons it may appear, however, that the main interest and merit of this work does not consist so much in the author's anecdotes of distinguished men as in his narrative of the secret and less familiar history of very important and familiar events. The book begins in 1819—when the Holy Alliance, the Six Acts, and the highest of Toryism were in the ascendant. It ends in 1837, when every trace of them had perished. There is no better or more graphic history of these remarkable events extant than is to be found in Mr. Greville's contemporaneous memoranda—and his habit of leaving his daily impressions uncanceled, while it impairs the accuracy of his opinions, adds greatly to the vividness of his book as a history. Nothing can be more interesting than to watch, through these faithful pages, the gradual decay of old abuse, and the rise of genuine constitutional popular in-

fluence. The squabbles of men and cabinets, and the intrigues of party, as we now look back on them through a vista of forty or fifty years, important and absorbing as they were at the time, were but the indications of elements over which cabinets and statesmen had little power. But it is through that medium that we can trace most accurately the growth and progress of that great political revolution through which, in the space of fifteen years, this country passed, happier than its neighbours, without anything which deserved the name of popular tumult, and with increased security and stability to all its ancient and constitutional institutions.

ART. X.—*Hansard's Parliamentary Debates for the Session of 1874.* April to August. London: 1874.

ON March 19, 1874, commenced the first session, since that of 1841, in which the 'Conservative' party could boast of a substantial majority assembled to support a 'Conservative' government. Never did session open with fairer promise. The appeal to the constituencies, so suddenly made by Mr. Gladstone, had resulted in the total discomfiture of his forces and the positive dislocation of the Liberal party. The Gladstone Ministry had not only fallen, but in their fall had broken up the phalanx, which had sustained them in power, more completely than any political party has been broken up in this country since the days of the first Reform Bill. Clergy, Nonconformists, Permissive-Bill men, Publicans, suspended their differences among themselves to join in common hostility against a government which had managed to rub them all up the wrong way. The men who desired continual and rapid progress in a democratic direction were dissatisfied with the pace of the Ministry, while that very pace had frightened out of their wits no inconsiderable portion of the more quiet and sober part of the community. A general dread of what was to come next appeared to pervade the country, and that 'Conservative reaction,' the existence of which had been so often denied, proved to be a living reality, which its greatest opponents were at last forced to admit. Mr. Disraeli was carried into power as the harbinger of rest to a people weary of over-legislation, as the champion of every class and interest which had been 'harassed' and 'worried,' as the statesman who alone could remedy the 'plundering and blundering' of the recent administration, who would oppose 'unnecessary' restraint and meddling interference with the affairs of the

people; and who desired that there should be 'a little more energy in our foreign policy, and a little less in our domestic legislation.'\* The Church was to be preserved, the 'strength and stability of England' maintained, and salutary Conservative progress to take the place of reckless Radicalism and revolutionary concessions to the spirit of democracy.

Seldom, if ever, has a minister had greater opportunities of carrying out a policy and consolidating a party. No doubt, the responsibilities of power had come upon him somewhat suddenly, and the usual time for the preparation of Government measures had, from the force of circumstances, been denied to him. But, on the other hand, the country neither desired nor expected any great novelties in legislation. Upon certain social reforms public opinion had not only made up its mind, but the measures necessary to carry those reforms into effect were actually ready to hand. The obvious course before Mr. Disraeli and his colleagues was to deal with those subjects, and with as little else as need be, during the session of 1874, leaving until next year those efforts of legislative genius for which the preparation of the autumn months might be necessary.

This course, indeed, appears to have naturally suggested itself to the Conservative Cabinet, as may be gathered from the contents of the Queen's Speech, delivered at the opening of the session. In this document, after the usual allusions to passing events, her Majesty called the attention of her Parliament, in the first instance, to 'the delay and expense attending the transfer of land in England,' which 'have long been felt to be a reproach to our system of law, and a serious obstacle to dealings in real property.' Secondly, the extension to Ireland of 'the re-arrangement of the judicature, and the blending of the administration of law and equity which were effected for England by the enactment of last session,' were recommended to the notice of Parliament. Allusion was next made to Scotland, and the Legislature was invited to 'consider the most satisfactory mode of bringing the procedure upon appeals into harmony with recent legislation,' whilst it was also intimated that measures would be introduced 'for amending the law relating to Land Rights, and for facilitating the Transfer of Land' in that portion of Great Britain. Then, after a passing allusion to the defective state of the laws 'affecting the relationship of Master and Servant,' to inquire into which a Royal Commission had been issued, her

---

\* See Mr. Disraeli's Address to the Electors of Buckinghamshire.

Majesty's Speech concluded with the promise that a bill should be introduced 'dealing with such part of the Acts regulating the sale of Intoxicating Liquors as have given rise to complaints which appear to deserve the interference of Parliament;' and that the attention of Parliament should 'also be directed to the laws affecting Friendly and Provident Societies.'

It cannot be denied that the above programme was one fairly in accordance with the promises made by Conservative candidates throughout the country at the recent general election. It certainly contained no foreshadowing of any measure which could be called 'sensational,' an epithet which had been freely, and perhaps not always unjustly, applied to the legislation of Mr. Gladstone's administration. On the other hand, it gave promise of various steps in the direction of social improvements, and dealt with subjects rather of practical interest to the community than of political advantage to one party or the other. This, indeed, was what had been hoped for and expected by the large numbers of moderate men who, wearied by the continued course of exciting legislation which had marked the last five years, threw in their lot with Conservatism at the elections, and placed in power the minister whose natural and inevitable policy appeared to be one of a character the reverse and opposite of excitement.

Nor is it easy to understand why the programme set forth in the Queen's Speech should not have been fully carried out. Not only had Mr. Disraeli that which is called in parliamentary phraseology 'a good working majority' at his back in the House of Commons; not only did he enjoy that advantage of an equal majority in the hereditary branch of the legislature which had been denied to his predecessors, but his power was enormously increased by the total and entire disorganisation of his opponents. Never was a party more dispirited and unnerved than that which had ruled the destinies of the country for the previous five years. The great leader whom they had followed had not only shattered their forces by the precipitate dissolution which had taken them, rather than their adversaries, by surprise, but had deemed it right and wise, after the first few nights of the session, to leave them to themselves, only returning at a later period for special reasons to which we shall hereafter have to allude, and when his presence scarcely compensated for the months of uncertainty and disorganisation which his followers had meanwhile endured. Indeed, so doubtful was it whether Mr. Gladstone would still consent to lead the Liberal party, and whether the

united Liberal party would consent to be led by Mr. Gladstone, that during the earlier months of the session other names were freely mentioned, and the relative claims canvassed of several of the more prominent members of his late government.

All these things combined to make Mr. Disraeli the undisputed master of the situation, and to render it certain that any measures which his Cabinet agreed to push forward resolutely would become law during the coming session of Parliament. Under such circumstances it becomes interesting to compare the speech delivered at the close of the parliamentary campaign with that which heralded its commencement. How has the programme been fulfilled? With what success has the Prime Minister used his opportunities, and utilised the majority given him by the general election? How has he profited by the dissensions of his opponents, the loyal unanimity of his friends, and the strong current of public opinion which bore him so triumphantly to his present position? We read with attention the Speech with which the session has been closed. We pause for a few moments to consider it in the light of the occurrences of the last two months, and we throw up our hands in astonishment.

Is this a reality? Are the two speeches the work of the same hand? Do we stand in the presence of the strong Conservative Government which was to effect so many wise and salutary social reforms, to remedy the grievances of the 'harrassed' classes, and to give comfort and security to everybody? Or have we been living for the last six months in the presence of a solemn sham? Are these men, after all, no better than those who went before them, and has nothing been changed except the names of our ministers?

The first thing which strikes us is that the 'measures of general interest and importance,' the passing of which her Majesty 'observes with satisfaction,' are by no means those measures the introduction of which was promised on March 19. There is indeed allusion made to 'the measures for facilitating the Transfer of Land in England, for re-arranging the Judiciary of England and Ireland, and for establishing an Imperial Court of Appeal.' But alas! this allusion is only made in order that her Majesty may express her 'regret that the pressure of business in the House of Commons has made it necessary to suspend the consideration' of all these measures, which are relegated *en masse* to 'a future session.'

Indeed, with the exception of a 'legal measure' with reference to 'Land Rights and Conveyancing in Scotland,' not

one of the quiet, useful, domestic, unsensational reforms promised in March forms the subject of her Majesty's congratulation to her faithful Parliament in August. 'Friendly and 'Provident Societies' have dropped out of sight, the Royal Commission upon the working of the Master and Servant's Act 'has not concluded its labours in time for legislation this 'year,' and Scotland has only received an instalment of the 'measures relating to her special interests,' which were announced in a separate paragraph of the opening Speech, and had doubtless kindled a lively hope in the breasts of our northern brethren, who had in the last Parliament become almost jealous of the time and trouble bestowed on Irish, to the detriment and neglect of Scotch, legislation.

One measure, indeed, promised somewhat prominently in March, had become law by August, and, strange to say, this was the only promised measure which partook somewhat of the 'sensational' character ascribed to the proposals of Mr. Gladstone's Government. The bill for 'regulating the sale of 'intoxicating liquors' might indeed fairly deserve that epithet. It was (with an exception to be named hereafter) the one attempt which was to be made to undo the 'harassing' legislation of the last Parliament.

In almost every county and borough of England the 'worn' class of licensed victuallers had made themselves heard and felt. It is the fashion at the present moment to assert that 'the trade' which, by its organisations and exertions, undoubtedly exercised a considerable influence over the late elections, was excited and roused to action, not by the Licensing Act of 1872, but by the bill introduced by Mr. Bruce in 1871, which fell by the weight of its own unpopularity before it could reach the stage of the second reading. There is no doubt that the bill of 1871 did infinite mischief to the Cabinet which unwarily suffered it to be introduced, and to the party who, however unfairly, were identified by the publicans with the measure so introduced, to which they never had the opportunity of stating their objections in Parliament. It is equally true, however, that the Act of 1872 was also strenuously condemned by 'the trade,' and that the addresses of 'Conservative' candidates teemed with denunciations of its severity; those who had not sat in the Parliament of 1868 declared that they 'should have opposed' the bill had they been there, and those who had seats in that Parliament, and who, in common with the whole of the Conservative party, had been consenting parties to the passing of the bill, suddenly became aware of its imperfections and freely promised to



remedy the grievances of which 'the trade' complained. Mr. Disraeli himself, in his famous Glasgow speech, had been supposed to refer specially to the licensed victuallers as a 'harassed' trade, and his accession to power was aided in no small degree by the action taken by these oppressed men throughout the country. It was natural, therefore, and indeed necessary, that an amending bill should be forthwith introduced by the 'Conservative' Government, and we cannot be surprised that this promise, at least, should have been fulfilled, and the measure duly passed.

But how passed and how fulfilled? It is by no means our intention to enter into a minute criticism of the provisions of the Licensing Laws Amendment Act, or to contend that some alterations have not been made which were desired by 'the trade.' Such alterations, indeed, are almost always necessary after the working of any important new Act has been tested for a year, and there is very little doubt that they would equally have been effected if the late Government had remained in office. But the measure actually passed was (in the words of the 'Times' newspaper) 'a feeble relic of that which was put 'on the table of the House of Commons.' Intended as a measure of relaxation, it has become a question whether it is not rather one of further restriction, and this has assuredly been the case so far as concerns the point upon which the loudest complaints had been made, namely the hours of opening and closing public-houses.

Upon this point nothing could exceed the vacillation of the new Home Secretary, who in his extreme and good-natured anxiety to please everybody very nearly succeeded in satisfying nobody. Eventually, an extra half-hour was given to London (which we believe had already been half promised by Mr. Lowe during his short reign at the Home Office), but in the country towns the publicans must have been sorely disappointed at the result of their friends' legislation. The bill which Mr. Cross introduced in April proposed that in towns being urban sanitary districts and containing ten thousand inhabitants or more, public-houses should be closed at half past eleven, and in other places at eleven. The bill when it became law enacted that, out of London, eleven should be the latest hour of closing, and this only in 'populous places,' the hour elsewhere being fixed at ten. As no argument can prove this to be anything else than a restriction, it can hardly be said that the hustings promises of relaxation have been fully realised.

Then, whereas the local magistrates had, under Mr. Bruce's

Act, a discretionary power of fixing the hours of closing within certain limits, it was formally announced, as a concession to the publicans who objected to this power, that it should no longer be suffered to exist. However, when difficulties arose as to the hours of closing in country districts, the Home Secretary left it to the licensing committees to decide in what localities, being 'populous places,' public-houses might remain open until eleven, instead of being arbitrarily closed at ten. But, inasmuch as no definition of 'populous places' was given to guide the local authorities, it is obvious that their discretionary power remains. One licensing committee may be of opinion that a population of a thousand people within two square miles constitutes a 'populous place,' whilst the next local authority may require the same population to be massed within half that area. The discretion, therefore, to which so much objection was raised, is virtually left, and the concession to the publicans is practically 'nil.' Indeed, the different and varying decisions which have been given by 'Licensing Committees' since the passing of the Act, prove to demonstration that, instead of settling a vexed question, it has introduced a fresh element of uncertainty and made confusion worse confounded. Again, upon the question of the hours of opening in the morning, Mr. Cross showed himself lamentably weak, shifting his opinion between five, six, and seven o'clock, and eventually taking refuge under the plea that, after all, the question of hours was really only one of detail.

With regard, then, to this bill—the *one* government measure, promised in March, which reached maturity—it must be confessed by any impartial observer that it fell very far short of the promises made and the expectations entertained upon the subject with which it dealt. Nor, indeed, was the failure undeserved. Perhaps there never was a more unjust, ungenerous, and unfair piece of electioneering strategy than that which united the brewing and licensed-victualling interest throughout the country in favour of Conservative candidates at the general election. Not only was the Conservative party equally responsible with their opponents for the legislation of 1872, but during its progress they made no attempt whatever to protest against its restrictive character, and Mr. Disraeli himself took no part either in the debates or the divisions upon the subject. The truth is that the country had determined to legislate upon the matter, and all parties concurred in the necessity for legislation. The party which did not happen to hold office at the moment, after joining in the demand for that legislation and generally supporting it, did not scruple to take

advantage upon the hustings of its temporary unpopularity, and the most bitter condemnation of their selfish and unpatriotic course is to be found in the fact that, having acceded to power with a substantial majority, they have been able to make no serious changes in the law, have restricted rather than relaxed, and have been obliged to lay upon the table of the House of Commons reports from local authorities throughout the kingdom which tend to show the good working of the 'unpopular' Act and the injustice of their own outcry at the elections.

But if only one 'promised' measure can be mentioned in the Speech with which the session was closed, it cannot be denied that our attention is fairly called to other 'measures of general interest and importance.' The Act 'for improving the Health of Women, Young Persons and Children employed in Manufactures,' belonging, as it does, rather to Mr. Mundella than to Her Majesty's Government, need not be touched upon in the present article. Mr. Sclater Booth's 'Valuation of Property' Bill, also, may be passed by without comment, being, in fact, nothing more nor less than a portion of Mr. Stansfeld's rating bill of last session, of which fact the Government were so clearly aware that, with natural modesty, they have refrained from alluding to it at all in the Speech. The bill, however, is a good bill as far as it goes; and one satisfactory result of the accession of the Tories to office is to be found in the fact that the House of Lords consented to pass, with little debate and no alteration, the very measure of which they could not see the merits, but rejected with contumely, when proposed by the Liberal Government.

But two measures which are mentioned, and one which is not mentioned, in the Speech, occupied much of the time of the session, and call for our attentive consideration. We allude, of course, to the Church Patronage (Scotland) Act, the Public Worship Regulation Act, and the Endowed Schools Act Amendment Bill. With regard to the first-named measure, few words only will be necessary. Although opposed with much vehemence, notably by the ex-premier in the House of Commons, it passed by large majorities, and was supported by no inconsiderable number of Liberals in both Houses of Parliament. The only remark we would make is upon the fact that this important bill should not have been foreshadowed among the promises of Scotch legislation, whilst others of possibly less interest were promised only to be omitted in the legislative programme. Whether it result in the strengthening of the Church of Scotland, according to the wishes of its supporters, or whether, as its opponents predict,

it must inevitably lead to the disestablishment of that Church, it cannot be denied that in its scope and character this was a bill to which a prominent place should have been given in the Speech from the throne, and which should not have been introduced excepting as one of those measures of first-class importance to which such place is commonly assigned. .

The two other bills require fuller discussion, not only on account of their intrinsic importance, but because of the light which they shed upon the constitution, harmonious action, and administrative capacity of the Government. As is well known, one of these was and one was not introduced as a Government bill, and to neither was any allusion made in the Queen's Speech in March. Probably it was not the intention of the Government at that time to deal with either of the subjects which they embraced, although some action would in any case have been necessary with regard to the Endowed Schools Commissioners, whose powers would have lapsed during the present year unless extended by Parliament. It is not our desire to criticise too closely the conduct of the Commissioners. The opinion of the House of Commons probably reflected that of the public out-of-doors, and may be expressed in the words of the hackneyed quotation that these officials had lacked the 'suaviter in modo,' while practising the 'fortiter in re.' However, since another quotation may also be aptly introduced—'De mortuis nil nisi bonum,' we should be indisposed to visit their sins upon the defunct Commissioners, even if those sins were of a graver character. They had many enemies and were not without zealous defenders in the House of Commons, and it is neither our business to attack or defend them here. Suffice it to say that in their fall they have had the satisfaction (if satisfaction it be) of materially injuring their destroyers.

Seldom indeed has any ministry introduced and conducted a measure in a manner so damaging to itself. The simple abolition of the Endowed Schools Commissioners would have been a step hardly unpopular either with Parliament or the country. They had discharged disagreeable functions in a manner not particularly agreeable, and the transfer of those functions, whether to the Charity Commissioners or elsewhere, would have caused comparatively little discussion. Unfortunately, however, the Government resolved upon doing something more. Whence came the suggestion or whose the influence which inspired the Endowed Schools Act Amendment Bill may never be known. It was remarked, however, during the progress of the bill, that its provisions bore a marked resemblance to the amendments moved by Mr. Hardy in the commit-

tee upon the Endowed Schools Act of 1869 which sat in 1873, and to a certain speech made by the Marquis of Salisbury in the same year. Be this as it may, the bill not only provided for the destruction of the Endowed Schools Commissioners and the transfer of their powers to the Charity Commissioners, but it proceeded to deal with those ominous subjects, the interpretation of founders' wills, and the character of religious instruction in certain schools.

We purposely forbear from any minute scrutiny of the particular clauses of the bill, because it is the time and manner of its introduction with which we are at this moment concerned, rather than with the intrinsic merits of the measure itself. Whether good or bad, this bill, like the Church Patronage (Scotland) Bill, was one which dealt with matters of great public interest, and, if necessary to be considered at all in the session of 1874, should have been prominently noticed and introduced as one of the important measures of the Government programme, instead of being left unmentioned in the Queen's Speech. What actually happened? The division upon the second reading only took place upon the 14th July, a few days after the bill had been introduced by Lord Sandon in a speech which deserves separate and especial notice, as marking the 'animus' and spirit by which a section of the present Government and their supporters (more powerful perhaps from their quantity than their quality) are actuated upon religious and educational questions.

During the discussions in the last Parliament upon the Endowed Schools Bills, the Elementary Education Bills, and other measures upon kindred subjects, wise and moderate men upon both sides of the House exerted themselves to the utmost to prevent questions of such general and national importance from falling into the category of subjects which could be legitimately made the property of one political party or the other. The formula 'this is no party question,' was urged upon the House of Commons over and over again, and one at least of the causes of the defeat of the Liberal party at the polls was the determination of a certain section of Nonconformists to bind every Liberal candidate within the narrow limits of their own sectarian views.

There were those, indeed, who stood out boldly against such dictation, and not a few moderate Liberals, in and out of Parliament, had taken a firm stand upon the question of religious education, irrespective of the pressure of party and the possible risk to their own political existence. If these men could be driven nearer to that section of their party which they had hitherto

opposed, such speeches as that of Lord Sandon would more than anything else, conduce to such a result. It is but fair to say that the House of Commons was evidently astonished at such a speech proceeding from such a speaker. Lord Sandon is generally known as a young nobleman of a disposition singularly gentle and amiable, conscientious in the discharge of his public duties, and although warmly attached to the Church of England of which he is a member, so thoroughly imbued with what are called 'Low' church principles as to be very much in sympathy with the great body of Protestant Dissenters. From such a person we should have expected a studied moderation of tone and sentiment upon a question requiring peculiar delicacy of touch in the presence of such an audience as the House of Commons.

Unfortunately, however, this was entirely wanting in Lord Sandon's address. The words 'the Conservative Party' and 'the Liberal party' were of themselves ominous of evil in a discussion upon an Endowed Schools Act Amendment Bill, and the whole tenor of the speech was to show that 'the Liberal party' had done something against the Church and religious education which 'the Conservative party' were about to undo by this bill, now that they had obtained a Parliamentary majority. The Nonconformists were alternately threatened and cajoled—being at one moment 'political Nonconformists' against whom battle was to be done, and at the next instant 'my Nonconformist brethren' who were to receive with meek affection the gifts of the Education department. In a word, the speech was one which, coming from such a quarter, did more to inflame religious animosity and stir up sectarian bitterness than any speech which has for years past been delivered from the front benches on either side of the House of Commons.

The effect of the bill and the speech combined was one probably unexpected by the Government. The scattered fragments of the Liberal party re-united almost as one man. Those Dissenters who had loudly exclaimed against the concessions to Church prejudices supposed to have been made by the Gladstone Government, and who had attempted to banish Mr. Forster from Parliament, if not to ostracise him altogether from the Liberal party, saw at a glance that something worse might be feared from the genuine Toryism and sectarian zeal displayed by the new Vice-President of the Council, and recognised at once the fact that they could no more afford to dictate to the Liberal party than the Liberal party could afford to ignore their just claims to consideration. Conscious that they

had pushed matters too far, and that they stood a good chance of marching out of the frying-pan of Forster into the fire of Sandon, they gladly rallied once more to their former friends, and a glimpse of Liberal re-union was seen by those who had begun to fear that the days of Liberal union were over.

Thus far, then, the Government had committed two grave blunders; first, in introducing a bill in July which involved the consideration of matters far too momentous to be hurried through at the fag end of a session, and secondly, in dealing with those matters in a manner which afforded to the opposition an opportunity of healing their differences and finding a common point of agreement for which they might otherwise have sought in vain. But their blunders did not end here. Mr. Forster's motion for the rejection of the second reading was negatived by 291 to 209. Nothing daunted, Mr. Fawcett moved an amendment upon the next stage of the bill to the effect that, 'in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient to sanction a measure which will allow any one religious body to control schools that were thrown open to the whole nation by the policy of the last Parliament.' These words sufficiently indicate the supposed tendency of the Government bill and the causes of the determined opposition which it encountered. The debate upon the amendment, commenced on the 20th, terminated on July 21st, when the division showed 193 for, to 262 against, being a reduction of the Government majority from 82 to 69; and it became evident that the bill could not pass in its then shape without further long and vehement discussions, every hour of which tended to the consolidation of the Liberal party and exposed the differences existing among the supporters of the Government.

Wednesday and Thursday, the 22nd and 23rd July, were consumed by discussions in committee, most damaging to the Government, the members of which seemed unable either to explain the provisions of their bill or to agree in their explanation, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Cross, and Mr. Hardy having delivered speeches the incongruity of which was ably exposed by more than one Opposition speaker. The affair had really become almost ludicrous, and the debates upon the latter clauses of the bill would so evidently have still further injured the position of the Government that a change of front appeared absolutely necessary.

It may well be doubted, however, whether the manner in which this was effected was not at least as disastrous as would

have been perseverance with the objectionable clauses. When the bill next came on for discussion, Mr. Disraeli rose in his place to announce the abandonment of the clauses in question and the restriction of the bill to the mere abolition of the Endowed Schools Commission and the transfer of their powers to the Charity Commissioners. His speech, however, was one of the most extraordinary ever delivered by a Prime Minister on such an occasion. He noticed the fact that the disputed clauses had given rise to great difference of opinion as to their construction and meaning, and declared that, although the confession might seem to prove his incapacity to fill the position he occupied, he must confess that after hours of anxious consideration, the clauses were unintelligible to him—they had been so drawn that he was positively unable to understand them. He had accepted them on the faith of ‘the adepts and experts’ to whom he had looked for instruction in such matters—they had failed him, and the meaning of these clauses of his own bill was obscure and hidden from his comprehension. They would therefore be withdrawn, and the bill reduced to the smaller compass above mentioned, while the Government would postpone to another session the amendments in the law which they might deem necessary.

Never was a greater triumph achieved by a minority than that which these words conveyed to the Liberal Opposition. They had been again and again charged with having interposed unfair obstructions to the bill, the clauses of which they had declared to be of an interpretation not admitted by the Government, and one of the Solons of the back Tory benches (whose interposition at critical moments of a debate had more than once excited the good-natured ridicule of the last Parliament) had, in tones absurdly grandiloquent, accused them of ‘factious opposition.’ Now, however, by the confession of the Prime Minister himself, they were proved to have been correct in their declaration that the latter clauses of the bill were ambiguous and obscure, and their course of ‘obstruction’ was more than justified by the highest authority.

The opportunity was too good to be lost. Mr. Gladstone, who had gallantly fought the battle of the moribund Commissioners, pointed out with withering scorn the vacillating conduct of the Ministry, and the inconsistency of its individual members. He showed how that, whatever excuse might have been found for the removal of men from the performance of duties which were about to be changed in their scope and measure by the application of a new or a modified principle, that excuse perished at once with the abandonment of the clauses



which directed and defined such application. The bill, therefore, sank into a personal question, and became one (as Mr. Childers aptly remarked in the course of the debate) for the removal of three persons appointed by the late, and the substitution of three to be appointed by the present Government.

But Mr. Gladstone's speech, powerful and telling as it was, hardly damaged the Administration so much as the scene which immediately followed. Member after member rose upon the Conservative side, deprecating or approving the course of the Government, each according to his own particular view. Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Talbot, and others eagerly caught at the concluding words of the Prime Minister, as implying a pledge that the Government would introduce more intelligible clauses in the next session of Parliament, securing to the Church that control over certain endowed schools which they had hoped to have secured under the clauses about to be abandoned. Mr. Charles Lewis, on the other hand, representing an Irish constituency containing many Protestant Nonconformists, and alleging that he spoke for many Conservative members around him, declared his approval of the course adopted by the Government, denied that any pledge had been given or implied by the Prime Minister, and trusted that no such clauses or any of the same character would be again introduced.

The discussion was altogether one of the most damaging which the Government had as yet undergone. The general impression was left that the clauses which had been the subject of dispute had been introduced into the bill at the express desire of the more Conservative section of the Cabinet, and in order to satisfy the pledges upon the subject of Church and religious education given by many of the Conservative party for the purpose of conciliating and securing that clerical support which had so greatly aided them at the elections. Their abandonment, therefore, was regarded as a proof of the comparative weakness of that section when encountered by the more Liberal element of Disraeli-Conservatism by which the Cabinet, the Government, and the Conservative Party has of late years been leavened. It proved, moreover, that the compactness and unity of that party was more apparent than real, and that a breach existed which circumstances might at any moment widen and deepen in the time to come.

Nor, indeed, was the abandonment of certain disputed points in a Government bill the worst feature in the case against the Government. The blame openly cast by Mr. Disraeli upon the draughtsman was at once so ungenerous and so unusual in Parliamentary warfare, that it left an impression upon the public

mind which has by no means been effaced by the subsequent words of the Lord Chancellor 'in another place,' to the effect that he 'should deprecate nothing so much, and of nothing should he be more ashamed, than that the Government of which he was a member should attempt to throw upon draughtsmen the responsibility which rested on themselves.' It is no excuse for Mr. Disraeli that the charge against the draughtsmen is utterly absurd to any person conversant with official life, because this is not the case with the great majority of the public, who would read and accept as true the statement of the Prime Minister on such a matter. The truth is, that (unless we are to pre-suppose an idle and incompetent Ministry which does not or cannot attend to the ordinary business of official life), no Government bill goes into the draughtsman's hands without the most precise and careful instructions from that department of the Government which is about to be responsible for its conduct through Parliament. On leaving the draughtsman's hands, such a bill, before its introduction into either House of Parliament, is invariably submitted to the most careful scrutiny of the same department, the head of which usually goes clause by clause through the bill with the draughtsman, and makes himself thoroughly conversant with its clauses and their construction. We may add that anyone acquainted with Sir Henry Thring will need no assurance from us to convince him that in this as in every other case nothing was left to chance, the instructions given by the Educational Department were clearly understood, and the bill drawn in strict accordance with those instructions. If a Prime Minister, or any other official person, were once to be allowed to shift the responsibility, which properly attaches to himself, on to the shoulders of a non-political official, irresponsible to Parliament, the whole framework of our Constitutional Government would be shaken, and the principles destroyed upon which our Parliamentary debates are conducted. It must therefore be conceded, even by his friends, that Mr. Disraeli's statement upon the occasion in question was a grave error, and one which could not but be damaging to the Government of which he is the head.

The climax, however, had yet to come. As soon as the bill had been reduced to the narrower compass in which it was to pass, the Prime Minister was importuned for the names of the three new Commissioners who were to replace those about to be abolished. After a delay, not unnatural under the circumstances, Mr. Disraeli chose his own time to make the desired announcement to the House, and, in passing, it may be observed,

that 'no objection can be fairly taken to the names of the gentlemen selected. Canon Robinson, having already served on the Endowed Schools Commission, will bring the advantages of experience to the assistance of his colleagues; Mr. Longly has also official knowledge to justify his selection, and the character of Lord Clinton is sufficiently well known to give ample security for the due and conscientious discharge of the duties which he is about to undertake.

But, unfortunately for himself, Mr. Disraeli took the opportunity of making this announcement to enlighten the House of Commons still further upon the birth and progress of the abandoned clauses. It had been imputed to Lord Sandon, he said, that he alone was responsible for the bill which had been under discussion. Such, however, was by no means the case. It was a complete mistake. *The bill was the bill of the Cabinet, and had been prepared by them.* He, Mr. Disraeli, had requested his noble friend (Lord Sandon) to introduce the bill as the organ of the Government, and the representative of the Educational Department in the House of Commons, from his habitual wish to 'give a chance' to the 'rising statesmen' of the day.

This, indeed, was a confession. The bill which the Prime Minister had declared to be unintelligible to his mind, after 'hours of careful consideration,' had, after all, been the work of his own Cabinet! Men began to ask themselves what sort of Cabinet this could be which prepared measures beyond the comprehension of their chief? and what sort of a Prime Minister was it who could request a subordinate to introduce and explain to Parliament a measure which he himself had failed to understand?

The answer to these inquiries, and the general result of the introduction of, and the debates upon the bill, could not but be unfavourable to the Government. Confident of their ability to sweep away the unpopular Commissioners, they had endeavoured to introduce under the shadow of that proposal the alterations in the law relating to endowed schools which had been pressed upon them by the most intolerant and probably least wise of their supporters. Finding themselves thereby brought face to face with an opposition the strength and vehemence of which ought to have been foreseen by statesmen of ordinary sagacity, but which appears to have been by them quite unexpected, they shifted from pillar to post, exposed their own internal differences as plainly as their most bitter opponent could have desired, evinced an indiscretion in debate rarely equalled in the British Parliament, and after having declared

through the mouth of Cabinet ministers that great alterations in the Act of 1869 were indispensable to its good working, finally consented to pass their bill without any such alterations, and to leave it more than doubtful whether they will make any further attempt to re-open the question. The law will be administered by fresh hands indeed, but it is untouched and unaltered, and the only thing damaged has been the reputation of the Ministry, which, with a large majority in both Houses of Parliament, has been obliged to yield to the minority upon a question which, in opposition, they had made a constant weapon of attack against their predecessors, and which they have now been obliged to confess themselves unable to understand, and still more unable to present in a satisfactory shape for alteration or amendment before the legislature of their country.

The third bill, unmentioned in the Speech at the opening of Parliament, but upon the passing of which congratulations have been offered in the Speech delivered at its close, is one which differs materially from those to which allusion has already been made, in that it was not introduced at all as a Government measure. The Public Worship Regulation Bill was brought into the House of Lords by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York upon their own responsibility.

As to its origin and intention there can be but little doubt. The innovations in the conduct of the services of the Church which have been introduced by various clergymen throughout the country, in many instances not only without consulting the feelings and wishes of their parishioners but in direct opposition thereto, have for some time past given rise to scandals which have threatened to sap the very foundations of the Establishment. It is not only that the innovations themselves have been unpopular, but the manner of their introduction has frequently tended to increase that unpopularity. Moreover, the importance of the whole matter, and the probability of its working mischief to the Church, have been greatly aggravated by the tone and temper with which certain of the innovators have acted, declaring themselves superior to the law when decided against them, and refusing to acknowledge the validity of decisions given by competent authority.

There cannot be two opinions upon this point. In our free England any man has a right to interpret 'the Law of Christ' as he pleases, and to act according to his interpretation, so long as in so doing he does not offend against public order and morality. But no man has a right to become an officer of the Established Church of England, to hold a benefice therein, and to participate in the advantages derived from such a position,

unless he is prepared to submit to the laws and conform to the discipline by which the Established Church is controlled and governed. As a sworn officer of the Establishment, it is his duty to subordinate his individual opinion as to the 'Law of Christ' to that which has been pronounced to be such by the authorities to which the Establishment submits, and if he finds himself unable to do this with a clear conscience, the sooner he gives up his preferment and quits the Establishment the better. Those, therefore, who remain as beneficed clergymen of the Church of England, and refuse to obey the law, should doubtless be rendered amenable thereto without unnecessary delay or expense being entailed upon those whose duty it is to put that law into execution.

This, doubtless, was the main object of the two Archbishops in introducing the bill now under discussion. It was avowed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his opening speech; and although attempts were afterwards made to show that the measure was intended to be impartial in its operation, and indeed sins of omission as well as those of commission were eventually included in its scope, it became abundantly clear throughout the discussions in both Houses that Ritualistic excesses had produced the bill, and that its operation was mainly to be directed against those Romanising tendencies which were attributed to that section of the clergy by whom such excesses had been introduced and practised.

It is unnecessary to state the arguments for and against this particular measure in an article which assumes to touch upon it only in relation to its treatment by the Government of the day. Much may be said upon the question whether legislation upon so delicate a matter as the internal discipline of a Church does not carry with it inherent difficulties which may easily outweigh and overbalance the possible advantages to be gained. It may be alleged with no little force that a broad foundation and an elastic discipline are indispensable to the existence of a National Established Church, and that anything must be injurious which tends to tighten the one or to narrow the other. Moreover, it may be stated with truth that a measure aimed at one party in the Church may be turned against another, and that to facilitate the legislative action of one section against another within the same Establishment is certain eventually to play the game of those who would disestablish altogether.

But whatever may be the merits or demerits of legislation upon Church matters in general, or of the Public Worship Regulation Bill in particular, it can scarcely be denied that

the subject was one of a magnitude which should have secured to it the position of a Government question. No doubt the Archbishops and Bishops should have been consulted upon such a question, but a bill which dealt with matters relating so closely to the connexion of Church and State should have been in the hands of the responsible Ministers of the Crown.

Far from this having been the case, Government not only stood aloof in the first instance, but the differences existing in the Cabinet upon this bill were over and over again exposed, and even unnecessarily paraded, during its passage through Parliament. In the House of Lords, the Lord Chancellor gave the measure a helping hand, whilst Lord Salisbury and Lord Carnarvon evidently regarded it with no friendly eye. In the debate upon the second reading in the House of Commons, Mr. Hardy vehemently denounced the bill, and in the divisions which subsequently took place Sir Stafford Northcote, Lord John Manners, and several of their colleagues of lesser note, voted in a direction hostile to the measure. On the other hand, Mr. Cross and Mr. Cave had spoken in its favour, and much doubt existed as to the course which would be taken by the Conservative leader and his personal adherents.

The reason of the course ultimately adopted by Mr. Disraeli will perhaps never be exactly ascertained. Two causes might appear probable to the attentive observer of passing events; but perhaps it would, after all, be untrue as well as uncharitable to attribute to either of these the attitude and action which at once secured the passing of the bill and rendered impossible either opposition or material alteration. One of these possible causes was the sudden re-appearance upon the scene of Mr. Gladstone, and the strategical error which accompanied that re-appearance. Between the opponents of the bill on either side of the House a plan of action had been arranged which seemed likely as far as possible to unite in one lobby those who from widely different reasons objected to the measure. An amendment proposed and seconded by Mr. Hall, the new member for Oxford, on the one side and Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen on the other, advocated delay in facilitating the execution of the law whilst the law itself was in an uncertain condition. A motion for adjournment upon the first night of the debate upon this amendment had been supported by 114 members against 275, the minority including about an equal number from either side of the House, and comprising the names of several ministers and ex-ministers. But Mr. Gladstone thought fit to interpose with a notice of a series of resolutions to be moved

at a subsequent stage of the bill, which materially disconcerted the plans of the opponents and strengthened the hands of the supporters of the second reading.

The opportunity was too tempting to be resisted. Mr. Disraeli perceived in the resolutions of his great rival a golden road to popularity and his own triumphant establishment as the champion of Protestant ascendancy. The latter position was indeed challenged at a later period by Sir William Harcourt, who completely threw into the shade Messrs. Newdegate and Whalley, and may be held to have equalled if he could not eclipse the Prime Minister in the ardour of his professions of attachment to Protestant principles and the warmth of language with which he denounced 'the Ritualists.' But, for the moment, Mr. Disraeli was unrivalled. He declared that the resolutions of Mr. Gladstone had placed the matter in a new light altogether; but for these, he might have suffered the bill to take its chance like any other measure in the hands of a private member, but now it would be his duty to afford every facility for its discussion and to forward its chance of passing by the giving of 'government days' for its consideration.

There might, indeed, as we have said, have been another cause for Mr. Disraeli's interference. Since the bill had reached the Commons public attention had been called to it in a far greater degree than before, and the petitions in its favour considerably outnumbered those which were presented against it. This indication of public opinion, together with the majority which had supported Mr. Russell Gurney in resisting the motion for adjournment, had not escaped the observation of the astute minister, and, after all, it was easier to throw over a colleague or two (an operation to which he was not wholly unaccustomed) than to persuade and overcome a Protestant majority in the House of Commons. Certain it is that from whatever cause Mr. Disraeli's action proceeded, it was one which changed the whole position of the bill and secured its passing into law.

There were those who were unable to perceive how the scope, character, and importance of a measure could be entirely altered by the placing upon the table by an ex-minister certain resolutions which were afterwards withdrawn without explanation or discussion. Others there were who felt that the longer Mr. Disraeli dwelt upon the importance of the bill the more convincingly did he prove that such a measure should have been introduced by a Government, and not left in the hands of a private member. But, whatever may have been

thought by outsiders, the fact remained the same. The bill which had been elsewhere described as a bill to facilitate procedure was emphatically announced by the Prime Minister to be a 'bill to put down Ritualism,' and its opponents were from that moment exposed to all the taunts and reproaches of those who accepted the definition and approved the object.

It was of little consequence to Mr. Disraeli that the discussion of a measure which, dealing as it did with matters bordering upon religious controversy, required to be conducted with especial calmness, should have been embittered by words which would have been injudicious if spoken by any statesman, but which were doubly so when coming from the Leader of the House of Commons. Neither did it matter to the Prime Minister that some of the most influential of his colleagues were placed in a somewhat awkward position by his sudden adoption of the Archbishops' bill. There was something, however, which *did* matter considerably, and which it would have been well for Mr. Disraeli to have remembered before he committed himself to active partisanship in favour of the measure in question.

There were other measures to which his Government stood pledged, and which had commanded a more general approbation than usually falls to the lot of Government proposals. The Judicature and Land Transfer Bills had passed through the House of Lords, moulded by the joint application of such minds as those of Lord Cairns and Lord Selborne, and there is no reason to doubt that they would have safely encountered the ordeal of the Lower House. True it is that they were not bills by means of which public opinion could be excited or party passion kindled, but all the more were they measures to have been steadily pressed forward by a Government which had expressly denounced the 'exciting' and 'sensational' legislation of its predecessors. They were eminently useful and practical measures, precisely such as might have been expected from men who had been constantly preaching upon the necessity of an epoch of quiet practical legislation upon social and domestic matters.

But when, in addition to the time wasted upon the abortive attempt to reverse the Endowed Schools' legislation of 1869, the Prime Minister undertook to give Government time for the discussion of the Public Worship Regulation Bill, one of two consequences was inevitable. Either the great Law Bills must be abandoned, or Parliament must be asked to sit to a later date than had been contemplated. An earnest, active minister would have chosen the latter alternative, and sub-



mitted to the personal inconvenience and the temporary unpopularity which would have been incurred with holiday-loving legislators, rather than have sacrificed the most important Government measures of the session. Mr. Disraeli preferred the former course, and without scruple threw overboard the two bills, which a very little extra exertion would have passed into law. Nor is it easy to find an excuse for their abandonment. After all, the House of Commons had done comparatively little work. It had met some seven weeks later than usual, and had in fact scarcely begun real work before April. Then there had been fewer 'morning sittings' than for many years past; and in fact, if recourse had been had to the system of morning sittings, and the House of Commons could have restrained its impatience to be prorogued for one week longer, the Law Bills of the Government could in all probability have been passed, and the scandal avoided of the abandonment of legislation upon the two subjects which had been most prominently recommended by her Majesty to the attention of Parliament.

It is certain that by the course which he thought fit to take Mr. Disraeli placed himself in a dilemma from which it is not easy to discover the way to escape. Either the Public Worship Regulation Bill was a bill of such primary and pressing importance that it should have been boldly taken in hand by the Government, and announced in the Queen's Speech as one of their principal measures for the session, or else it was a bill of less importance than the Judicature and Land Transfer Bills, in which case the latter should not have been sacrificed in order to secure it a safe passage through Parliament. In either case, the action of Mr. Disraeli was not that of a wise and far-seeing minister; and in spite of the momentary popularity which it may have secured for him, at the expense of some of his colleagues, will probably be found to have added as little to the stability as to the harmony of his Cabinet.

The meetings of the latter, indeed, towards the close of the session, must have been of a somewhat exciting character, unless (as is very possible) the Public Worship Regulation and Endowed Schools Act Amendment Bills were subjects to which allusion was, by common consent, avoided. Even in this case, however, there must have been trying moments for the Conservative Cabinet, especially after the scene with which the debates upon the Archbishops' Bill finally closed.

An amendment had been inserted in the Committee of the House of Commons, upon the motion of Mr. Holt, one of the members for Lancashire, giving an appeal to the Archbishops in the case of a Bishop deciding against the institution of pro-

ceedings in the event of a complaint against a clergyman in his diocese. This amendment, warmly opposed at first, had only been carried by a greatly reduced majority, on the report of the bill, when Mr. Gladstone had moved its rejection. It was struck out in the House of Lords, on the return of the bill to that august assembly, and Lord Salisbury, in opposing it, alluded to the feeling among the Peers against reversing a decision of the House of Commons in terms which offended the susceptibilities of certain members of that honourable House. It turned out, indeed, that these terms had been misunderstood, and that the words 'blustering majority of the House of Commons' to which exception was taken, had actually never been used. This fact, and the exact words which had really been employed by Lord Salisbury, could without difficulty have been ascertained in a few minutes by Mr. Disraeli.

Nevertheless, when Sir William Harcourt (in a speech as remarkable for the contempt which it evinced for his own leader as for the extravagant laudation which it bestowed upon the Prime Minister, whom it contrasted with his colleagues in terms by no means flattering to the latter) had called attention to Lord Salisbury's reported words, Mr. Disraeli deemed it right and fair to an absent colleague, not only to assume at once that the words had been spoken as quoted by Sir William Harcourt, but to refer to them and to Lord Salisbury in the following terms:—*'My noble friend was long a member of this House, and is well known to many of the members even of the present Parliament. He is not a man who measures his phrases. He is one who is a great master of gibes, and flouts, and jeers; but I don't suppose there is anyone who is prejudiced against a member of Parliament on account of such qualifications. My noble friend knows the House of Commons well, and he is not perhaps superior to the consideration that by making a speech of that kind, and taunting respectable men like ourselves as being a "blustering majority," he probably might stimulate the amour propre of some individuals to take the very course which he wants, and to defeat the bill. Now I hope we shall not fall into that trap. I hope we shall show my noble friend that we remember some of his manœuvres when he was a simple member of this House, and that we are not to be taunted into taking a very indiscreet step, a step ruinous to all our own wishes and expectations, merely to show that we resent the contemptuous phrases of one of my colleagues. I trust, therefore, that the House will consider this question, not with reference to some expressions in a speech*

*'which may have had the calculated intention of inducing members of this House to give a rash vote.'*

This defence of a colleague, which provoked 'laughter,' 'renewed laughter,' and 'cheers and laughter' throughout, was perhaps such a defence as no statesman, serving in the same Cabinet with another, had ever undergone at the hands of his chief, and was certainly in marked contrast to that which would have been offered by prime ministers who have flourished in our own time. Well do we remember the words of Lord Palmerston, when the attempt was made by an opposition orator to depreciate the conduct of the then Foreign Secretary, Lord Russell, and at the same time ostentatiously to exculpate the head of the Government from any participation in the blame attributed to that statesman. 'I cannot accept a compliment,' said Lord Palmerston, 'at the expense of my colleague,' and the House of Commons of that day recognised the chivalrous honour and loyalty of the words.

But the days of Palmerston are passed, and loyalty to a colleague is no longer the prevailing sentiment of prime ministers. Mr. Disraeli accepted without reluctance the adulation of Sir William Harcourt, and his 'noble friend' was left to submit as best he could to the imputation of having made a speech with a 'calculated intention' to effect something which he did not express a desire to effect, of being a man who 'does not measure his phrases,' and a politician whose 'manœuvres' are to be remembered and guarded against by his colleagues and the House of Commons. It is of course impossible to calculate the amount of humiliation which men will consent to undergo for the achievement of some cherished object. Those, however, who know Lord Salisbury cannot but be aware that, whatever may be his faults, no object binds him to official life under Mr. Disraeli save a singleminded desire to serve his country according to the best of his ability. Lord Salisbury, after the events of 1867, can only have joined the present Government from a conscientious belief that it was his duty to assist in the consolidation of the Conservative party, and the exclusion from power of a Government which, according to his views, had been rapidly drifting into democracy and imperilling the safety of the country by its frequent attacks upon institutions which are sacred in the eyes of Toryism. There is a point, however, at which the sacrifice of personal feeling to political exigency can no longer be made, and Lord Salisbury, having already performed that sacrifice in again linking himself with the political leader from whom his alienation since 1867 has been so conspicuous and complete,

can hardly be expected to submit to treatment which would be galling to a person of a far less high spirit and keen sense of honour than he is known to possess.

But incivility to a colleague, and the sacrifice of good measures, are not the only mistakes which Mr. Disraeli has committed with reference to the bill under discussion. Having ignored the subject altogether at the commencement of the session, having only thrown himself into the fray when the tide had evidently set in one direction, and having done so in direct opposition to several of his Cabinet, Mr. Disraeli actually had the hardihood to claim for his Government, in his speech at the Mansion House, the credit of having, as a Government, 'grappled with the mysterious disturbance which has risen up 'amongst us,' and led the popular feeling for the indication of which he had carefully and silently waited before declaring any opinion at all upon the matter. The cool assurance of this claim would provoke a smile, did not its disingenuousness compel one to blush for the statesman who could make it. The Public Worship Regulation Bill of 1874 has been passed with the concurrence and approbation of the great majority of the people of this country, who dislike ritualistic excesses and desire the enforcement of salutary discipline in the Established Church. It has been passed by large majorities in both Houses of Parliament, and its passage has doubtless been facilitated by the attitude eventually taken by the Prime Minister when stirred into action by the reappearance of Mr. Gladstone upon the stage. But to attribute the bill or its success to the Conservative Government would be as unjust and untrue as to give them credit for the Ashraftee campaign which was undertaken by their predecessors, or for the creation of the surplus which they found ready to their hands upon their accession to office.

Nor indeed is it indicative of a healthy and satisfactory condition of public life, when we find Cabinet Ministers taking, some one side and some another, upon a question which has greatly stirred the public mind, and the Prime Minister himself, at first standing aloof, then throwing his weight into the heaviest scale at the critical moment, and afterwards claiming for his Government the credit of having directed and supported a popular movement which, so long as its popularity was doubtful, had been 'an open question' upon the Treasury Bench.

We have a right to expect from our ministers some consistency of conduct and unity of action, and if upon subjects of such importance as that in question differences prevail in the

Cabinet, those differences should not be paraded before Parliament but arranged in the council-chamber. If they are differences of a vital character, the men who differ are unfit to serve together in the same Cabinet; if they are of a minor degree and importance, the one section must yield to the other. But differences among Cabinet Ministers upon subjects of great public interest ought not to be exhibited upon the floor of the House of Commons. Parliament and the country have a right to expect an expression of opinion from a united Cabinet upon questions of such a character, and the exhibition of the past session has neither added to the credit and stability of the Administration, nor tended to strengthen that system of Parliamentary government of which we are so justly proud.

It is not only, however, in respect of the legislation with which they have dealt that the Conservative Government have failed to satisfy the expectations which their hustings' promises had excited in the breasts of their countrymen. They have to answer for sins of omission as well as for those of commission. The 'army and navy' were words of ominous import to Liberal candidates at the general election. It was said, widely and loudly, that 'the two services' had been sadly mal-administered and grossly neglected by Mr. Gladstone's Government. Conservative candidates did not scruple to assert that great discontent existed among our soldiers and sailors, a discontent at which no one could be surprised who believed one half of the record set forth of mistakes and mismanagement.

The abolition of purchase in the army had struck, we were told, a fatal blow at our military power, and had been effected in a manner most unfair upon the officers. So much was this the case, in the opinion of the Conservative party, that the son of the present Secretary at War, Mr. J. S. Hardy, speaking at Rye immediately before the election, and in the presence of his father, actually boasted that he 'had the satisfaction of fighting against that measure upon every occasion,' and declared that it had been passed 'for the benefit of the poor officers of the army, but when the new system was worked it was found that they were losers.' Moreover, it was confidently asserted by Conservative orators that the measures of the late Government had engendered desertion among the men, had rendered recruiting difficult, and had, in a word, seriously impaired the efficiency of our army.

The condition of the navy was represented as even worse. In the pursuit of a false and visionary economy, the Liberal Administration had closed dockyards, discharged men, cut down

estimates, and so terribly mismanaged matters that we had now a fleet of unseaworthy ships, short of men, only existing upon paper, and altogether unequal to the wants and requirements of the greatest naval power in the world. These grave charges were so frequently and confidently advanced, that it is no matter of surprise if they were more or less believed by the electors throughout the different constituencies of the country, and if they had been true, the condemnation and expulsion of the ministry against whom they were made would undoubtedly have been justly deserved. But the best way to judge of their truth is to examine the conduct of those who have succeeded to the places held by the members of the late Administration, with the special mission to supply their deficiencies and remedy their mistakes.

Mr. Hardy has now presided at the War Office for more than six months, and for all that he has said or done, Lord Cardwell might as well have remained there. There has been no confirmation of the alleged difficulty in obtaining recruits, no allusion to the increase of desertions, and what is more, no attempt to reverse any portion of the policy of the late Secretary at War. Indeed, so contented and tranquil does the army appear to have been, that Mr. Hardy has had time to spare from the special business of his own department in order to pay that amount of attention to the Endowed Schools and Public Worship Regulation Bills which has brought him into such uncomfortable collision with his chief. Never was there a more triumphant vindication of a minister's policy by his successor than that which has been exhibited by the silence of Mr. Hardy upon the matters of which complaint had been so bitterly made against the preceding Government. For Mr. Hardy is not a man who objects to attack his political opponents, or who (to borrow Mr. Disraeli's expression) 'measures his phrases' in the attack. Had there been sufficient justification for the Conservative abuse of Lord Cardwell and his policy, the session of 1874 would not have passed without a withering exposure from Mr. Hardy of the evils which he had found in the War Office, and the mischief which had resulted from the mismanagement of the late Administration. The absence, therefore, of any such exposure, and the quiet manner in which Mr. Hardy has conducted the Parliamentary business of his department, must be taken as tolerably conclusive evidence of the slender foundation upon which rested the hostile criticism of Conservative candidates upon Lord Cardwell and his measures, and should strike the

critics with shame as they reflect upon the practical refutation which their criticisms have received.

The attacks upon the recent naval administration have been sustained no better. Mr. Ward Hunt certainly gave them some colour when, early in the session, he made a dismal speech about fleets which existed only upon paper, and held out such expectations of increased estimates to be forthwith introduced, that people really began to believe that the navy was in an inefficient and discreditable condition. Upon this point Mr. Goschen's observation was unanswerable: 'To tell the country,' he said, 'that they (Mr. Gladstone's Government) had been starving the dockyards, that what had been done was insufficient, and yet to abstain from measures to correct the evil, while they had a surplus of six millions, could not be endured. If the late Government had left the navy inefficient, they had at least given their successors a surplus of between five and six millions, and he therefore asked the Government not at the same time to denounce their parsimony, while taking advantage of their surplus to apply it to other objects.' When, however, the Secretary of the Admiralty was put up to soften matters down, to confess that we still possessed a fleet sufficiently strong to overcome the combined fleets of any two or three other nations, and that the estimates were not after all to be increased as had been threatened by his departmental chief, men's minds gradually calmed down, and they perceived that after all, Mr. Hunt had only with commendable honesty carried the opinions of opposition into Government, and must be excused for having required a little more time than some of his colleagues to ascertain and confess that those opinions were inconsistent with the facts, and that the conduct of the preceding Administration had not been marked by that folly and recklessness with which it had been credited by Tory orators and embryo Tory statesmen.

There was also the further excuse for Mr. Hunt that ships and naval matters were quite strange to him, nor indeed could he have had much opportunity of preparation for his new work, since he could hardly have expected that a party who had so loudly blamed Mr. Gladstone for placing at the Admiralty such untried landmen as Mr. Childers and Mr. Goschen would be content to see the same place filled by the good-natured Northamptonshire squire who had undergone his previous official training in an entirely different department. One is inclined to be sorry for Mr. Hunt, who must have felt the humiliation of having to submit to the practical disclaimer

by his colleagues of the big words with which he introduced his estimates; but he is not the first statesman who, when invested with the responsibilities of office, has felt the inconvenience of rash and reckless statements made in opposition.

This inconvenience must indeed have pressed severely upon several members of the Government during the financial discussions which occupied the earlier part of the session. It is not within our province to-day to enter into a defence of the financial policy of Mr. Gladstone's Administration. Against that policy the Conservative opposition consistently protested during the Parliament of 1868, as indeed they had similarly protested against a like policy during Mr. Gladstone's previous guidance of the Exchequer under Lords Palmerston and Russell. The first act, however, of Mr. Disraeli was to entrust the Chancellorship of the Exchequer to that statesman among his colleagues who was Mr. Gladstone's pupil, and whose financial views had been matured in the same school as those of that great statesman.

Certainly it would have been difficult for the new Conservative Government to have justified the predictions of failure with which they had greeted the financial schemes of their opponents, or to have attempted the reversal of that policy which had proved so completely successful. During the five years 1868-74 the Gladstone Government had in round numbers paid *twenty millions* on account of extraordinary charges, remitted *twelve millions* of taxation, and reduced the capital of the national debt by *twenty-five and a half millions*. They had practised a rigid economy, and introduced valuable administrative reforms, which had brought down upon their devoted heads no small measure of abuse and obloquy. The result, however, was to leave a magnificent surplus, foreshadowed by Mr. Gladstone in his address to the electors of Greenwich, but the existence of which was disputed by the very men to whom ultimately fell its distribution.

There can be little doubt that, had Mr. Gladstone remained in office, the country would have been once more electrified by one of those brilliant budgets by which his financial fame has been established. The promise that the Income Tax should be abolished would have been carried out, though, in all probability, its abolition would have only formed part of a fiscal scheme of a magnitude to equal some of the mighty transactions of days gone by. The opportunity was denied him, and the scheme has never been disclosed, but the surplus justified the expectations held out in the Greenwich address, and one of the first duties of Sir Stafford Northcote was to grace-



fully acknowledge the error of the Conservative denial of its existence, and to excuse himself from any participation in that denial.

But although he had at his disposal the largest surplus ever yet distributed by a British Minister, the difficulties in the path of the new Chancellor of the Exchequer were not inconsiderable. The Conservative opposition had been generally willing to support any independent proposal to remit taxation, whilst at the same time they had constantly and consistently joined in demands upon the public exchequer which will probably even now rise up in judgment against them before their tenure of office has endured much longer. They had pledged themselves to the relief of local burdens; no inconsiderable portion of them had advocated the claims of malt to be considered in the next remission of taxation; and they had angrily disputed the right of Mr. Gladstone and his friends to speak of the abolition of the Income Tax as a Liberal idea, when, according to their election addresses and platform harangues, it was in reality part of the programme of the Tory party. The question of brewers' licenses was also an awkward one for some of the majority in the new Parliament, and various other minor matters were likely to prove troublesome to the statesman who found the National Exchequer so unexpectedly placed under his control.

Indeed it was hardly possible for Sir Stafford Northcote to deal with the inherited surplus at all without wounding susceptibilities, treading upon tender places, and giving offence to certain Conservative orators and politicians who had spoken more boldly than warily upon the great questions of Taxation and Finance. Sooth to say, good Sir Stafford himself was not exempt from the inconvenience consequent upon such rash utterances as those to which we have alluded. No later than April 28, 1873, he had criticised at some length the financial policy of the Chancellor of the Exchequer of Mr. Gladstone's Government, especially with regard to the proposed reduction of the sugar duties; and alluding to a remark of Mr. Lowe's that 'the complications of the system of the sugar duties are quite intolerable, and that it would be a point in financial ethics to get rid of them,' had observed, 'The right honourable gentleman must excuse us, if we say there are other people who might be allowed to enlarge upon the complications of the Income Tax, and if we may be allowed to measure financial ethics on one side against financial ethics on the other, *I am not at all sure that the moral philosopher would not give a preference to striking off the Income Tax.*'

In the same speech Sir Stafford had declared that 'strictly speaking, sugar cannot be described as the food of the poor;' and after asking, 'whether, if we went on reducing the tea and sugar duties until we reached a point at which it would be better to abolish them altogether, we could in justice refuse to do the same for malt,' had gone on to state that 'malt may not be among the food of the people, *but it enters more largely into the consumption of the people than sugar.*' During the whole of this speech, somewhat remarkable when contrasted with his financial statement in the present year, Sir Stafford endeavoured to undervalue the benefit to be received by a reduction of the sugar duties, and to contrast it with the greater relief to be afforded by the abolition of the Income Tax.

Nor had Sir Stafford Northcote stood alone in his doubts and fears as to the Budget of 1873. Mr. Hunt, the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Mr. Disraeli's last Administration, had doubted very much 'whether the consumer would get the benefit of the reduction of the sugar duties,' had contrasted the relative claims to reduction of malt and sugar, and had boldly declared that 'as between malt and sugar it might be disputed which was a necessary and which was a luxury to the working classes; but he felt quite sure that if he asked the working men in Northamptonshire their opinion on the subject, *every hand would be held up in favour of the remission of the duty on beer in preference to the remission of the duty on sugar.*' The same high authority had asked with an air of deep concern, 'If the *sugar duties were abolished, what source of revenue would be left?*' and the minor lights of 'the Tory party' had followed in the same track.

It must, therefore, have been with feelings of a mixed and curious nature that, upon his accession to office, Sir Stafford Northcote found himself obliged to follow in the track of his Liberal predecessor, and to propose the abolition of the sugar duties. Mr. Hunt had of course, by this time, convinced himself that some sources of revenue would still be left to us, even after that abolition, and was therefore able to sit quietly by the side of his colleague and concur in the measure which he had so much deprecated in the previous year. Discontent, however, was rife among the followers of the Government, and had not Colonel Barttelot acted as the decoy animal, the wild elephants below the gangway would have worked mischief even at the early period of the session at which the financial discussions were held.

Fortunately for the Government, the honourable and gallant member for West Sussex had in the previous Parliament been

entrusted with the conduct of the Malt Tax case, and thereby occupied a position which enabled him to counteract the movements of simple-minded, honest politicians like Mr. Fielden, who could not understand why malt should be preferable to sugar in opposition and sugar so much to be desired before malt in office. It must, however, be confessed that as far as the country is concerned Sir Stafford Northcote's budget was generally satisfactory, and the financial inconsistencies to which we have alluded are small items of account in the history of a political party so habitually and constantly inconsistent as the followers of Mr. Disraeli.

Nor indeed have other departments of the Government been managed without credit to those concerned in their direction. Whilst Lord Salisbury has evinced the vigour and ability in Indian administration which the country expected from a statesman who had already shown so much of both qualities, it would be unjust not to omit mention of the fact that he has been ably seconded by his subordinate in the House of Commons. Lord George Hamilton has gained deserved credit during the session by the manner in which he has conducted the business of his department, and has amply justified his selection by the Prime Minister for the office which he fills.

The Colonies also have been in good hands, although only two questions specially connected therewith have been prominently before Parliament—namely, the war on the West Coast of Africa and the proposed annexation of Fiji. With respect to the former, Mr. Disraeli had, in his manifesto at the general election, declared that, 'when our honour is vindicated, it will be the duty of Parliament to inquire by what means we were led into a costly and destructive contest which neither Parliament nor the country have ever sanctioned, and of the necessity or justice of which, in its origin, they have not been made aware.' These words, however, were little more than the claptrap of an electioneering address, and as soon as he was invested with the responsibilities of office the Prime Minister took a different tone. The Ashantee affair (which cost less than a million, and thus favourably contrasted with Mr. Disraeli's Abyssinian war) was discussed upon the motion of an independent member (Mr. Hanbury) and the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, with the only result of showing an apparent unanimity of opinion among the present and late officials of the Colonial Office; nor did one word of censure of the policy of their predecessors escape from the present occupants of the Treasury bench. In fact, the complete success which had attended Sir Garnet Wolseley's expedition,

planned under Lord Kimberley's rule and direction, justified the policy of the latter, and practically left little for Lord Carnarvon to do as regarded the past save to bestow honours and congratulations upon those who had taken part in the operations. His future policy upon the Gold Coast may be open to criticism, but it received none from the front bench of the Opposition, save in the shape of a general protest against the acceptance of any territory in which slavery exists. Perhaps even this protest might as well have been spared, since slavery cannot exist in any country which has once become British territory, and Lord Carnarvon is little likely to entangle himself with complications upon such a question.

The debate upon the possible or probable annexation of the Fiji Islands came on late in the session, and was rendered interesting by the speech delivered by Mr. Gladstone, in which he magnified the difficulties and dangers of annexation and supported an amendment, moved by Sir Charles Dilke, to the motion of approval submitted by Mr. M<sup>r</sup> Arthur. Even after this speech, however, it was impossible to forget that it was Mr. Gladstone's own Cabinet which had sent out the special commissioners whose report furnished the text for this debate, and that their instructions directed them to inquire into the course of action which it might be most desirable for this country to take, with an evident leaning to annexation, as that which seemed best to us at home, so far as we had evidence upon the subject in our possession.

It therefore became the duty of Mr. Gladstone's late Under-Secretary for the Colonies to set forth some of the reasons which might be urged in favour of annexation, and to uphold Lord Carnarvon's policy, which, so far as it had gone, had been precisely that indicated by Lord Kimberley in his letter of instructions. The difficulties pointed out by Mr. Gladstone were not unknown to those who had advised the course which his Cabinet had adopted, but they were only those which, in the formation of her colonies, this country has encountered before, and which she must be prepared to encounter again, unless those doctrines are to prevail which are advanced by that small and unpopular school which holds colonies and colonisation to be a source of weakness rather than strength to the empire. As regards Fiji, the debate clearly showed the tendency of the feeling of the House of Commons in favour of annexation, and their desire to avoid embarrassing her Majesty's ministers in their conduct of an affair peculiarly belonging, at this stage, to the executive government rather than to the deliberative assembly of the nation.

Little need be said as to the conduct of 'Foreign Affairs' during the past session. We have looked indeed in vain for 'a little more energy in our foreign policy,' which Mr. Disraeli, in his address to the electors of Bucks, had declared to be so desirable, and probably the great majority of Englishmen believe that, whether the name of the statesman who holds the seals of the Foreign Office be Lord Granville or Lord Derby, the policy of England will be very much of the same character. In the House of Commons Mr. Bourke has had little to do, but that little he has done well; and indeed there is no unfavourable criticism to be passed upon any of the Under-Secretaries of the Conservative Government, who, having been confined to departmental duties, have discharged them satisfactorily, and are receiving an official training the want of which must be often felt by their chiefs in the Cabinet, who for the most part have leapt into their exalted positions without that preliminary service as subordinates which would have been of great advantage to them in the conduct of public business.

Of the Board of Trade and Local Government Boards we have not had occasion to speak: both are in the hands of respectable country gentlemen, whose intentions are doubtless of the best description, and whose administrative capacity may possibly be tested next session. During the present year Sir Charles Adderley and Mr. Selater-Booth have got into no difficulties of which the public has been made aware; have not, as far as we know, differed materially from their colleagues, or, at all events, have not proclaimed their differences aloud in the House of Commons, and have been content to carry on the work of their predecessors in a quiet and unobtrusive manner. They may therefore be left unnoticed, in company with the Lords of the Treasury, the officers of the Household, and other respectable and inoffensive subordinates of the Government.

It remains to notice the Irish department, represented by Sir Michael Beach and Dr. Ball in the lower branch of the legislature. Impulsive and earnest, Sir Michael began the session by an unwise speech, which apparently showed his desire and readiness at once to repeal the Irish Church and Land Acts, and fall back upon the old Protestant 'no surrender' faction from which 'the Conservative party' has only in recent times been emancipated. But Sir Michael Beach speedily recovered himself, and his speeches and answers to questions from Irish representatives during the session have been firm, bold, and at the same time conciliatory to a degree

which gives promise of further Parliamentary success for the Irish Secretary. The Home Rulers have been somewhat less troublesome than was expected, and Irish affairs have hardly occupied much more than their fair share of Parliamentary time. It has indeed been already whispered by Tory partisans that under the rule of the Duke of Abercorn and Sir Michael Beach Ireland is already becoming more and more tranquil and prosperous. We are delighted to believe the statement, but it must not be forgotten that this increase of prosperity and tranquillity follows immediately upon the passing of those great remedial measures for Ireland, conceived and accomplished by Mr. Gladstone and warmly opposed by the members of the present Government. We hope that we have seen symptoms in the more recent speeches of Sir Michael Beach that this fact has not escaped his notice; and if he can make up his mind to accept the present condition of things, disregard the counsels of ultra politicians, and infuse a spirit of moderation into Irish affairs, we see no reason why he should not succeed in conducting the Irish business of the House of Commons in a creditable and satisfactory manner.

Upon a careful review, then, of the whole session, we come to the conclusion that in those departments in which little has been attempted save to proceed along the old lines marked out by their predecessors, that little has been tolerably well done by the present holders of office, and the subordinates of the Government have, as a rule, proved themselves to be fairly competent to the discharge of their official duties.

It cannot indeed be denied that the Government commands something less of public confidence and respect at the end than was accorded to it at the beginning of the session, but this is due to causes which we have already clearly indicated. It may be attributed, first of all, to the internal differences which have been so painfully exhibited; secondly, to the one attempt made to convert into a reality that 'Conservative reaction' which, although successful as an electioneering cry, cannot ever really be put into a practical shape; and, in the third place, to the vagaries and inconsistencies of the Prime Minister himself.

In all three causes there is hope for the Liberal party. There must always be internal differences in such a Government as the present, which is composed partly of men who have honestly disapproved of and opposed all the progressive measures of recent years, and would gladly see them repealed; partly of men who are to all intents and purposes as much Whigs as any who sit on the Liberal side of the House, and who are only associated with Tory colleagues because the

leaders of the Liberal party have too frequently allowed Radical men and Radical doctrines to over-ride those Whig principles of progressive improvement which are the only safe basis for a Liberal party in this country.

The Whig party will always be strong in England, because the Whig party is the moderate party, and Englishmen like moderation. But, by the force of circumstances, a large section of the moderate party (which, united, would be by far the strongest party in the state) sit on either side of the House, divided from each other by lines which are almost wholly imaginary and imperceptible when put to the test of inquiry and examination. So it is that the extremes on either side have an alternate advantage, according to the temporary inclination of the moderate party out of doors to one side or the other. If Mr. Gladstone had leaned more on his Whigs and less on his Radicals, he would be Prime Minister still ; if Mr. Disraeli leans more on his ' moderates ' and less on his Tories, he will maintain his position. But as Mr. Gladstone weakened his government, alarmed the moderate party in the country, and eventually lost power by relying upon the more advanced Liberals and despising his Whigs, so will Mr. Disraeli do precisely the same if he relies upon the real Tories of his party.

Probably he will be too clever to do so. His inclination at the present moment appears to be towards Ecclesiastical legislation ; and if he can succeed in taking a firm hold upon the Protestantism of the nation, it may stand him in good stead, even though it result in the loss of a colleague or two, and the alienation of a section of his old party. Even this, however, may be avoided by care and dexterity. The docility evinced by the great Conservative party in 1867, when, after years of battle against extension of the franchise, they swallowed household suffrage at the bidding of the great magician, may be equalled, if it cannot be surpassed, in the future. Mr. Disraeli may with impunity snap his fingers at the reactionary section of his followers, if he rightly appreciates the strength of his own position.

The country desires progress, but is determined that progress shall be cautious and gradual. The Cabinet of Mr. Gladstone fulfilled one half and entirely disappointed the other half of the country's wish. They gave us progress enough and to spare, but instead of making that progress gradual, they attempted in five years enough to have lasted us for twelve, and proportionally shortened their own tenure of office. The question now to be decided is whether such progress as the

country desires, and has failed to obtain under Mr. Gladstone, can be secured under Mr. Disraeli.

There must be no mistake about it. Failure to progress will be as fatal an error in one direction as a too rapid progress in the other. Any attempt to conciliate the classes whom he has drawn into his political net, by exciting their hope of obtaining 'reactionary' legislation, would do something, perhaps, to restore his credit for consistency, but would infallibly ruin his Government. The Duke of Richmond has succeeded in lowering the standard of education for the people, but no further steps must be taken in this direction. Endowments which have been declared national must not be claimed exclusively for the Church. There must be no stepping backward either in political or religious legislation; and if he desires to retain power, Mr. Disraeli must do so as the virtual leader of those Whigs who call themselves 'Liberal Conservatives.'

From the tenor of the above remarks it will be seen that, whilst we have freely criticised the conduct of Mr. Disraeli and his Government during the past session, we have no wish for his displacement in the present condition of the Liberal party. Indeed, if those Whig principles, which we believe to be the foundation of liberty and good government, can be better secured and advanced under an administration nominally 'Conservative,' we have very little objection to such a state of things. On the other hand, if by attempting to follow such a course Mr. Disraeli should break up the party upon the benches behind him, we can only hope that the leaders of the Opposition, grown wise by experience, will avoid the errors which destroyed the Gladstone Government.

The past session has proved two things clearly, if it has done nothing else. First, that the party which now holds the reins of power is by no means that united party which we had been taught to believe; and secondly, that in the Liberal party no man has as yet arisen who could replace Mr. Gladstone in the leadership with the general concurrence of Liberals. The first proposition is one which can have surprised no politician who has studied the events of the last few years. The Conservatives have achieved a political success; not by their advocacy of any great principles or measures, but by the union in their favour of a number of interests which had opposed the measures of their predecessors. Everybody who felt himself aggrieved by any legislation passed by Mr. Gladstone's Government was ready to ally himself with those whose object was to destroy that Government. As the measures of reform and change were so numerous during the last five years, and



as each such measure necessarily offended some 'vested interest' or another, it followed that the number of persons ready to join in the anti-Gladstone alliance was proportionally large. The work of destruction, therefore, prospered, and the Government fell.

But although an opposition may destroy, an administration must construct, and it is when construction became necessary, that the difficulties of the victors began. During the past session, what with the leavings of their predecessors, and the fair excuse which they had for doing very little in the way of legislation, they have managed to surmount those difficulties for the moment. But the time of trial is at hand. The concurrence of fortuitous atoms which shattered the Gladstone Government cannot easily be concentrated in the support of any measure introduced by the Disraeli Cabinet: that Cabinet, indeed, which can scarcely unite its own members cannot command unity outside the council-chamber. The experience of last session must inevitably be repeated in the next, and although differences may be patched up for the present, the discordant elements which have brought the present Government into power cannot long present the front of an united party.

We have spoken of Mr. Disraeli as possibly acting in the position of leader of those Whigs who sit upon his side under the name of Liberal Conservatives, and following a policy of moderate progress. But the difficulties in the way of such a course are not only inherently great, but are rendered greater by the nature and temperament of Mr. Disraeli himself. The calm guidance of men's minds is not so congenial to the Prime Minister as it might be to a leader of less brilliancy and genius. He is more likely to entrap his Tories into sudden Radicalism than to lead them quietly along the paths of Whig moderation. Too sagacious by far to allow himself to be tempted by the disciples of an impossible reaction, he may find his only chance of retaining power in the adoption of a programme which will place his followers in the same position with regard to certain 'popular' questions as that in which his strategy of '67 placed them with regard to Parliamentary Reform. A Disraelite Tory and a Radical of to-day are beings not more dissimilar than a Derbyite in 1865 and a Derbyite in 1867. History repeats itself; and the leader who having in 1859 stated it to be his mission to stem democracy, within eight years advanced further upon democratic lines than any statesman had hitherto ventured, may possibly not scruple to repeat the process if he should find

it convenient at a later period of his Parliamentary career. Mr. Disraeli can scarcely have required the teaching of the past session to learn its first lesson, and his policy will be directed to hold together the discordant elements out of which his Government has been formed, so long as they can be held, and afterwards to construct for himself, from the strongest surviving section of his followers, such a party as can be formed out of the materials at his command.

The second lesson of the session requires few words of comment. The absence of Mr. Gladstone from the debates of the House of Commons was scarcely necessary to prove that he has no equal upon the benches of the Opposition. How far that absence was judicious, and with what feelings Liberals may have contrasted the conduct of their great chief in abandoning them at the moment of defeat, with that of the Conservative leader when left in a similar position in 1868, are questions with which we are not concerned to-day. It may be observed, indeed, that a party left, not without a leader, but with a leader who does not take the lead, is hardly placed in a position favourable for the development of talent in its subordinate members; and if no one of the latter has advanced himself beyond his compeers during the past session, it may be owing in no small degree to the strange uncertainty of the position, and the natural desire of those who had served under Mr. Gladstone to do nothing which might appear to indicate a desire to alter his position with regard to the Liberal party.

It is evident enough that whilst Mr. Gladstone attends the House of Commons, though it be only occasionally, and takes part in the debates, no other man can be named for the leadership of the Liberals. But the Liberal leader at the present day has to play a game of patience which is perhaps scarcely congenial to Mr. Gladstone's character. The Conservative position cannot be carried by assault, and, having been provisioned by its opponents, may require a siege of some duration. There are always, of course, the accidents of war, and at any moment the dissensions of the garrison may prove fatal to their security. But, to drop the language of metaphor, the hopes of the Liberal party must rest at present upon quiet observation rather than hostile movements against the enemy. The opportunity for the latter will come in good time, but must not be sought too soon.

Unhappily, the want of unity is not confined to the Conservative side of the House, but has been conspicuously displayed even upon the front Opposition benches. Such a display must be avoided for the future. To organise and consolidate

are the principal duties of Liberals at the present juncture. Moreover, although the peculiar circumstances of the position may have placed the party and its leaders at some disadvantage, there has also been to some extent an equivalent gain. Liberals who distrusted the supposed Conservative tendencies of certain members of the late Government, especially upon religious and educational questions, must have learned that there is something still more opposed to their own views and wishes in the principles of the men who cheered Lord Sandon to the echo and still threaten reactionary attempts in the future. Those who looked coldly upon the late Administration because their own particular crotchets were not favoured, must have begun to see that those crotchets meet with no more support from the present Government, and have gained nothing by the change. In a word, the disciples of progress have received some few lessons, which they much needed, to teach them that progress is unlikely to be made well, wisely, and safely by those who have consistently opposed progress throughout their political existence, and that the substitution of a so-called 'Conservative' for a Liberal Government is little calculated to advance those Liberal principles which they profess to admire.

Future sessions will add to and improve the lessons of the year, but the retrospect which we have taken brings us to the conclusion that the Government of Mr. Disraeli, having come into office with golden opportunities, afforded by the strategical errors of its opponents, and their consequent unpopularity with the country, has, so far as it has gone, frittered away its opportunities, encouraged its adversaries by its display of internal dissensions, and, by its failure to redress the grievances upon which it traded at the elections, has in more than one respect proved the unworthiness of the means by which it obtained its majority in the House of Commons.

Next session, no doubt, will be the testing point of this Government. Much may be excused at present, in consideration of the newness to office of the men and the shortness of time for the preparation of the measures submitted to Parliament. These excuses, however, will not avail them next session. With ample time before them they have to arrange a programme which shall command the support of the various sections of their party. It is possible that circumstances may work in their favour, and that the great Law and Land Bills, with some measures of minor importance, may be eked out by ecclesiastical legislation, which the Prime Minister may manipulate with sufficient dexterity to enable him to postpone

action upon other matters more likely to stir up the latent differences existing among his followers.

On the other hand, the Government will have to act in the presence of an Opposition which has already begun to recover from the blow which fell upon it at the commencement of the present year. Every Government measure will be keenly scrutinised by vigilant eyes, and the Liberals will enjoy the advantages so freely used by their opponents during the last five years, of uniting in their favour the objectors to every Government proposal without the necessity of suggesting an alternative scheme. We shall await with interest the development of the Disraeli policy; but if it cannot be submitted to Parliament without at least some apparent unity in the Cabinet, some little courtesy of language between one colleague and another, and some show of consistency in the explanations of ministerial orators, we cannot anticipate either a long or a satisfactory existence for the new Government.

## NOTE

*to Article VI. in Number 285, p. 201 of this volume, on the  
'Canon of Beauty in Greek Art.'*

A correspondent has courteously called our attention to two errors of the press in our article in the July number of the 'Edinburgh Review,' on the 'Canon of Beauty in Greek Art,' which had escaped our own correction. In the table of heights, on page 193, the word 'femur' has been printed instead of 'sternum;' as an anatomist or an artist will readily have conjectured. And in the last line but one of the same table, the height from the upper part of the visible prominence of the ankle bones to the crown has been printed 804 lines instead of 864; which is the figure that coincides with the fraction, and with the upward measurement.

Another correspondent, in reference to the same article, remarks on the simple and beautiful series of dimensions which is presented by the girths; which he makes more striking by referring them to the girth of the shoulders, the largest horizontal dimension, as unity. All the other girths form aliquot parts of this dimension. If this horizontal maximum be divided, as the vertical height has been divided, into 360 lines, the series of 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 15, 24, 40, multiplied into 14 of these lines, will give the respective girths of the little finger, little toe, thumb, great toe, wrist, ankle, neck, and head. We have to thank our correspondents for the care with which they have perused an article which enters, necessarily, into so much detail. The elucidation of proportion, by presenting it at a glance, possesses much value and interest for the artist; although we do not think that it is of sufficient importance to lead us to depart from the simple rule of expressing every dimension, of every possible figure, in the nine-hundred-and-sixtieth part of its own vertical height.

## INDEX.

## A

'*Antechrist (L')*, par Ernest Renan, review of, 485—the Apocalypse a favourite subject with English commentators and theologians, 486—doubts as to the authorship of the Apocalypse, 488—M. Renan's views thereon, and as to the polemical purpose of the book, 490—1—probable date at which it was written, 492—who was the Antichrist mentioned therein, 493—Nero as a persecutor of Christians, 494—the Hebraic element in the early Christian Church, 495—6—the Apocalypse anti-Pauline, 496—and aimed against Rome, 497—500—Nero symbolised by 'the Beast,' 502—5—his character and cruelty, 505—7—his vanity, 508—his death, 510—the Apocalypse veritably a portion of God's Word, 511—5.

## B

*Barneveldt*, John of, Mr. Motley's Life and Death of, 107.

*Book of Carlaverock*, The, review of, 322—siege of Carlaverock Castle by Edward I., 322—4—origin of the Maxwells, 325—6—etymology of the name, 326—7—Aymer Maxwell, 327—9—Sir Eustace Maxwell, 330—1—Herbert Maxwell, the first of his house created a 'Lord of Parliament,' 332—the fourth Lord Maxwell, 334—the fifth Lord Maxwell, 334—9—the eighth Lord Maxwell and first Earl of Morton, 339—46—the ninth Lord Maxwell and second Earl of Morton, 346—the tenth Lord Maxwell created Earl of Nithsdale, 349—50—the second Earl of Nithsdale, called the 'Philosopher,' 350—the first Lord Herries, 351—the last Earl of Nithsdale, 351—2—the fourth Lord Herries of Terregles, 352—3—circumstances to which the 'Book of Carlaverock' owes its existence, 353—5.

## C

*Census of France in 1872*, 383.

*Cleashy-Vigfusson* Icelandic Dictionary, the, review of, 228—short history of the author's journeyings and labours, 228—35—examines the Gothic Gospels of Uphilas at Upsala, 236—death of his brother, 236—turns his attention to the study of theology, 237—is present at a banquet at Guildhall, 237—collates the 'Codex Argenteus,' and returns to England, 237—8—resolves to acquire a knowledge of Icelandic, 238—takes the first steps towards preparing an Icelandic Dictionary, 239—labours thereat assiduously, 241—his intention to publish a lexicon of the ancient Scandinavian language, 241—2—death of his father, 243—receives a proof of the first four pages of his Icelandic Prose Dictionary, 243—his illness and death, 244—

Dr. Dasent's account of what became of his valuable manuscripts, 245-6—great value of this dictionary to Teutonic philology, 246—modern English largely indebted to the languages of the North, 247-55—fulness and richness of the Icelandic, 256-7—its magnificent literature, 258.

*Cockburn, Henry*, Journal of, review of, 259—the work well edited, 260—Cockburn burns all his letters, 260—his speculations as to the effect on Edinburgh of more rapid intercourse with London, 261—his intense love of Nature, 262—his exertions to preserve beautiful localities from the requirements of roads and railways, 263—his political labours, 264—prepares the Reform Bill for Scotland, 264—intense excitement in Scotland during the progress of the Reform Bill through the House, 265-7—sketch of Lord Brougham, 267-9—Cockburn on terms of friendship with Sir Walter Scott, 269—his opinion of Macaulay, 269-70—his sketch of old Lord Lynedoch, 270—of Dr. Dibdin the bibliomaniac, 270—his description of Sir T. D. Lauder, 271-2—his high opinion of the eloquence of Chalmers, 272—the subject of Patronage in the Church of Scotland, 273-9—description of the secession from the Scotch Church and the establishment of the Free Church, 280—the present position of Patronage, 281-5.

*Comets and Meteors*, review of works treating of, 393—the comet of 1871, 393-4—that of 1843, 394—vast size of some comets, 394-7—Halley's Comet, 397-8—Coggia's Comet, 399—immense number of comets, 399—their coma, 400, 407—views of Newton, Herschel, Tyndall, and others as to the materials of which comets are formed, 401-5, 408-9—Donati's Comet, 405-6—figures described by comets in their course, 410-1—Biela's Comet, 411-5—the annual display of meteors in August and November, and causes of their occurrence, 415-7—the comet of 1866, 416—enormous number of meteors, 417—their probable sources and uses, 417-9—Mattiou Williams' 'Fuel of the Sun,' 419-24—the 'Dynamical Theory of Heat,' 425-6—the moon's orbit round the earth, and distance therefrom, 426.

*Convocation, Parliament, and the Prayer-book*, review of works treating of, 427—the recent Act for the Regulation of Public Worship, 427-8—brief history of Convocations from the time of Edward I., 431—Convocations during the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, 433-40—during the reigns of James I., the Charles', and James II., 440-2—from 1662 to 1700, 442—the functions of Convocation in abeyance for 135 years, 443—the Church-reforms of the present century effected with but little regard to Convocation, 443-4—incompetence of Convocations as legislative machines, 446—their impotence for anything progressive, 446-8—the dualistic theory of Church and State, 449-50—the party known as 'Convocation Reformers,' 450-3—Convocation, both before its revival and since, has originated nothing, 454-6—the Revision of the Authorised Version of the Scriptures, 455-6—the Ritual Commission, 457-8—report of Convocation on Ritualism, and the 'Times' thereon, 459-60—Parliament the proper authority to deal with ecclesiastical affairs, 461.

## E

*English Fugitive Songs and Lyrics*, review of works relating to, 355—Horace, 356—what is meant by the term *vers de société*, 357-60—Ben Jonson's address to Celia, 360-1—lines by Carew, 361—Robert Herrick, 361-3—Sir John Suckling's Ballad upon a Wedding, 363-4—the minor poets of the Restoration, 364-5—Edmund Waller and Dean Swift, 365-6—Matthew Prior, 367-8—Winthrop Mackworth Praed, 368-71—Peacock, 371-2—Luttrell's 'Burnham Beeches,' 372-3—Thackeray and Walter Savage Landor, 373-4, with extracts—Lord Houghton, 375—Mr. Frederick Locker, 375-80, with extracts—Mrs. Arkwright, 380-1—Mr. Austin Dobson, Lord Lytton, and others, 381-2.

## F

*France*, the census of, in 1872, review of works treating of, 383—slow increase of the French people, 383-6—increase in the number of deaths, 387—decrease in the number of births, 387—the French not given to emigration, 387-8—dense ignorance of a large part of the population, 389-90—causes of the above facts, 390-2.

*Fraser's Memoirs of the Maxwells, Earls of Nithsdale, Lords Maxwell and Herries*, 322-55.

## G

*Greek Art*, the Canon of Beauty in, review of works treating of, 168—progress of Greek art, 169-70—grandeur of Greek sculptures, 170-3—their close adherence to definite rules of proportion, 173-5—the Greek Canon of Symmetry, 175—works thereon, 175-80—ethnology as it affects proportion, 180-2—Dr. Lihartzik on the laws of symmetry, 183—proportions of the human figure according to Story, Bonomi, Gibson, and others, 184-6—the canon of Phidias, 187-8—that of Egypt, 189-90—the autometric system, 191-6—the collections of sculpture in the British Museum, 197-201—Note on, 590.

*Grenadier Guards*, the, review of Sir F. W. Hamilton's work on the origin and history of, 462—General Trochu on élite corps, and their bad effects when created at the expense of the general efficiency of the army, 462-3—the history of the Grenadier Guards a microcosm of that of the whole British army, 464-5—their formation during Cromwell's Protectorate, 468—their bravery at the battle of the Downs in 1658, 470—the regiment of foot-guards raised by Colonel Russell, 473—that under Lord Wentworth, 474—the two united, 476—some feats of arms of this regiment, 478—at Guildford, under Cornwallis, 479-80—at Turcoing in Flanders, 480-1—at Waterloo, 482—at Sebastopol, 483-4.

*Greville, Charles F.*, review of his Journal of the Reigns of King George IV. and King William IV., 515—circumstances to which the work owes its origin, 516—Mr. Greville's qualifications for such a journal, 517—his occasional asperity, 518—interesting nature of the work, 519—Lord John Russell, 520-1—Lord Palmerston, 521-3—Lord Melbourne, 523-4—Sir James Graham, 524-5—Lord Macaulay, 525-7—comparison between him and Lord Brougham, 527—Sir



James Mackintosh, 527-9—Mr. Disraeli, 530—Southey's letter to Brougham, 530—Wordsworth, 531—Talleyrand and Thiers, 531—the Duke of Reichstadt, 532—Mr. Canning, 533-5—the Duke of Wellington, 535-41—Sir Robert Peel, 541-3—Lord Grey, 544—Lord Brougham, 545-7—O'Connell and Lord Lyndhurst, 547-8.

*Guizot, M.*, review of his 'History of France,' 201—a knowledge of Roman history necessary to a French or an English historian 202-3—impartiality and accuracy indispensable, 203-4—M. Guizot's marked exhibition of these qualities, 205-8—his description of the growing power of the Crown in the French Parliament, 209-10—his dealings with the Church of the Middle Ages, 210-1—his toleration and breadth of view, 215-6—the career of the Maid of Orleans, how treated by him, 217-8—his account of the relief of Paris in 1436 219-20—the tragedy of St. Bartholomew's Day, 220-2—his apology for Henry IV.'s rendering himself over to the Church of Rome, 223—harmony between this and the author's earlier works, 224—favourable circumstances attending M. Guizot as a historian, 225-7—his optimism, 228.

## H

*Hall's* 'Modern English,' review of, 143—Anglo-American speech, 144—vast number of grammars of English published in America, 145—Mr. Hall's qualifications for his task, 145-6—how he has acquitted himself, 147-50—his spirit of detraction, 151-6—his charges against De Quincey and Coleridge, 156-9—his strictures on the purists in language, 160-3—the true function of criticism, 164-7.

*Hamilton, Sir F. W.*, his 'History of the Grenadier Guards,' 162-85.

*Hansard's* Parliamentary Debates for the Session of 1874, 549—the Queen's opening Speech, 550—compared with that at the close of the session, 551-3—small results of the session, 553—the Licensing Laws Amendment Act, 554—the Church Patronage (Scotland) Act 556—the Endowed Schools Act Amendment Bill, 557-62—announcements made to the House by Mr. Disraeli, 561-4—the Public Worship Regulation Bill, 565-70—Mr. Disraeli's observations in the House Commons regarding words supposed to have been spoken by Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords, 571-2—inconsistency of conduct and want of unity of action amongst the members of the Cabinet, 573—the army and navy falsely said by them to be reduced to a low state by Liberal maladministration, 574-6—the surplus and how Sir Stafford Northcote dealt with it, 577-9—general government of the Colonies and other departments of the State 580-1—'Foreign Affairs,' and the Irish department, 582-3—the best policy to be pursued by the Liberals, 583-6—probable tactics of Mr. Disraeli, 586-9.

## K

*Klappel's* 'Das Leben des Generals Von Scharnhorst,' review of, 287—the Count of Schaumburg-Lippe and his son William, 288—that so succession to his father's sovereignty, 289—his military maxims—his academy for carrying them out on the Steinhuder Lake, 290-1

Scharnhorst enrolled as a member thereof, 293-4—his commission from George III. as a cornet in Eighth Dragoons, 294—his career in the Hanoverian army, 295-8—his masterly night march from the fortress of Menin, 299-301—Prussia's humiliation, 302—Scharnhorst's services to Prussia, 303-11—the battle of Jena, 311-3—Scharnhorst's labours to regenerate the Prussian army, 315-8—its efficiency proved in future campaigns, 319-21.

## L

*Locker's, Mr.*, 'London Lyrics,' 377-80.

## M

*Moon, the*, Nasmyth and Carpenter's Physical History of, 72.

*Motley, John Lothrop*, his 'Life and Death of John of Barneveldt,' review of, 107—candidates for the inheritance of the Duke of Cleves, 108—Henry IV. of France, 108-9—Prince Maurice of Nassau, 110-2—Barneveldt, 112-3—Henry IV.'s energy and vast preparations, 114-6—his assassination, 116—its effect on France, 117—King James I., 118-9—the United Provinces of Holland, and what Protestantism owes to them, 119-20—the Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants, 121—enmity between Barneveldt and the Stadtholder, 122—Predestination, 123—King James I. thereon, 123-5—beginning of the Thirty Years' War, 125—Barneveldt's energy and extensive correspondence, 126-8—the proposed National Synod, 129—hostility between Maurice and Barneveldt, 129-33—arrest of the Advocate, 133—his trial, 134-9—his sentence and execution, 140-2.

## N

*Nasmyth's Physical History of the Moon*, review of, and other works, 72—some account of the author, 72-3—marvellous beauty of the pictorial illustrations, 73-5—size of the moon, 75—absence of air and water on its surface, 76—the lunar projections, 77—extinct volcanoes in the moon, 77—probable mode of formation of the moon's crust, 78-80—its craters, 80-5—its great vicissitudes of temperature, 86—its present fixedness of state, 87-8—can anything live there? 88—its first state probably a molten one, 89-90—Mr. Proctor's views as to the moon's aspect, scenery, and physical condition, 90-1—Newton's theory of gravitation, 92-4—the Royal Observatory at Greenwich, and Astronomers Royal, 94-9—irregularities in the moon's movements, 99-100—lunar tables, 101-4—libration of the moon, 105-6—the moon's orbit round the earth, 426.

See article on the 'Canon of Beauty in Greek Art,' 590.

## O

*Naval Warfare*, review of works treating of, 1—great revolution in maritime war since the battle of Trafalgar, 3—the old tactics, 4, 5—Nelson a great tactician, 5, 6—foreign writers on naval tactics, 7-8—Sir H. Douglas's essay, 8-11—ironclads and rams, 12-14—torpedoes, 14-5—increase in the power of artillery, 16-7—shells, 18—

Lieutenant Grenfell on the torpedo, 19-20—Captain Colomb's essays on naval tactics, 22-4—works by other authors, 24-31.

## P

*Proctor's* 'Moon, her Motion, Aspect, Scenery, and Physical Condition,' 90.

## S

*Scharnhorst*, General Von, 287. See *Klippel*.

*Session*, the and the Ministry, 554.

*Speaker's Bible*, the, review of, 32—its origin, character, and design, 32-3—the Geneva Bible, 34—the Bishops' Bible, 35—King James's Bible, 35—difficulties attending the selection of a competent staff of writers for the Speaker's Commentary, 36-9—the Old and New Testaments treated differently, 40-1—the Masoretic text, 41-5—ancient divisions of the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch, 45-8—the use of the definite article, 48-50—Mr. Clarke's errors pointed out, 51-3—Canon Espin's, 53-6—Canon Rawlinson's lack of Hebrew, 57-60—discrepancies in the views of the different contributors, 61-4—want of agreement as to the class of readers for whom they wrote, 64-5—the information in the foot-notes calculated often to mislead, 65-6—value of the Commentary as throwing light on questions of the day, 65-70—alleged discrepancies between Scripture and Science, 70-1—creditable way in which the work has been executed, 71.

END OF VOL. CXL.









